Thesis submitted
in fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of PhD in Classics, Field 1
of the University of London in 2007

AISCHYLOS AND THE TROJAN CYCLE

The lost tragedies

IOANNA HADJICOSTI

Department of Greek and Latin
University College London

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Abstract

This dissertation explores Aischylos' telling of myths from the Trojan cycle. Aischylos worked extensively on the story of the Trojan War in his lost corpus. He came across the stories in epic songs and brought them from epos to theatre, some of them for the first time. However, although his material came primarily from the Epic Cycle, he also drew on other sources such as Hesiod, lyric poetry and early tragedy. His reception of the stories was not passive. Aischylos endorsed but also adapted and sometimes rejected elements that he found in the earlier tradition and by doing so he reshaped many of the stories. Though the texts are long since lost, we can still detect many innovations in Aischylos' treatment of the Trojan war. The new elements that he inserted have various functions and objectives. Some may have served to minimise the distance between the mythical world of epos and that of his contemporary audience, with adjustments to the myth to make it conform to the value system of his own era and reflect ideas, social structures and politics of fifth century Athens. Some changes are meant to increase the tension in the stories and make them more shocking in order to generate stronger feelings among the audience. Passion, pain and loss were magnified to serve the purposes of the poet where needed. Aischylos' creative re-writing of one of the greatest and most famous stories in antiquity made an impression on fifth century Athens, as its reception in literature and art in general suggests. His impact on subsequent tragedy in particular, both Greek and Latin, is evident; though individual poets reacted in different ways to his work, his influence could not be ignored.

Ackowledgments

This work started under the supervision of Professor Richard Janko, whose enthusiasm at the early stages was motivating. I thank him deeply for his constructive advice and constant support. Several people have discussed with me parts of this thesis since. I have to thank Professor Edith Hall, Professor Cornelia Roemer, Mr Alan Griffiths and Dr. Antonis Petrides for the ideas they shared with me. My examiners have been most helpful. Professor Oliver Taplin and Professor Michael Silk enriched this thesis in many ways and gave it a more contemporary turn with their wisdom. I thank them both for the challenge and a wonderful journey. Professor Chistopher Carey has been an ideal supervisor. No doubt, his knowledge and love for the object inspired and shaped this thesis in many ways. Most importantly, his love for his students and his open heart inspired me as a person in more ways than can ever be told. I could never thank him enough for this lesson. Constantina Constantinou had the kindness to read the final draft. Any remaining errors are, however, my responsibility.

Ευχαριστώ πολύ, τέλος, την λατρεμένη μου οικογένεια και τους φίλους μου που στάθηκαν πλάι μου για πολύ καιρό και μου έδωσαν, όταν εγώ δεν είχα, δύναμη με την αγάπη τους.

CONTENTS

Editions

1. References to the extant plays of the tragedians are to the following editions:

Page, D.L., *Aeschyli Septem quae Supersunt Tragoedias* (Oxford) 1972.

Pearson, A.C., *Sophoclis Fabulae* (Oxford) 1924 [1971].

Diggle, J., *Euripides Fabulae* (Oxford) volume 1, 1984; volume 2, 1981; volume 3, 1994.

2. Fragments of Greek tragedy are cited from *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* [*TrGF*], (Göttingen). Volumes 3 (Aischylos), 1985, and 4 (Sophokles), 1977, are edited by Radt, S.; volume 1 (minor tragedians), 1971, is edited by Snell, B.; volume 2 (fragments of unknown authorship), 1981, is edited by Snell, B., and Kannicht, R.; volume 5 (Euripides), 2004, is edited by Kannicht, R.

3. Fragments of other authors are cited from the following editions unless otherwise indicated:

Epic Cycle: Bernabé, A., *Poetae Epici Graeci* [*PEG*] (Leipzig) 1987.

Lyric: Page, D.L., *Poetae Melici Graeci* [*PMG*] (Oxford) 1962.

Pindar: *Pindarus* (Leipzig) volume 1, 1987, is edited by Snell, B., and Maehler, H.; volume 2, 1989, is edited by Maehler, H.

Comedy: Kassel R., and Austin C., *Poetae Comici Graeci* [*PCG*] (Berlin) volume 2, 1991; volume 3.2, 1984; volume 7, 1989.

Hesiodic fragments: Merkelbach, R., and West, M.L, *Fragmenta Hesiodea* [MW] (Oxford) 1966.

4. Fragments of Latin tragedy are cited from the following works as indicated:

Warmington, E.H., *Remains of Old Latin*, volumes 1 and 2, [W] (London) 1936.

Accius: Antó, V., Di, *Accio: I frammenti delle tragedie* [D' Antó] (Lecce) 1980.

Ennius: Jocelyn, H.D., *The Tragedies of Ennius* [Jocelyn] (Cambridge) 1967.

5. For references to iconographical evidence the following edition is primarily used:

Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae [*LIMC*] (Zürich/Munich).

References and Abbreviations

In the spelling of Greek names and titles I have decided on transliteration, with very few exceptions (e.g. Homer, Pindar, Hesiod, *Iliad*, *Little Iliad*, *Odyssey*, *Seven*). I have made an effort to be consistent but also not to alienate the text. (Bakkhylides and *Bakkhai* have been exceptionally transliterated with *kh* instead of *ch.*) The abbreviations of the names of Greek authors and works normally follow those of the ninth edition of Liddell, H.G., and Scott, R., *A Greek-English Lexicon* [*LSJ*] (Oxford) 1968, and its supplement.

In the bibliography I have listed all remaining books and articles used, by name of author, date, title and either place of edition (for books), or periodical and volume number (for articles), or title, editor(s) and place (for collected studies editions). The date of the first edition of a book is, when appropriate, followed in brackets by the date of the edition I have used (e.g. 1976 [2007]). In the footnotes the references to the bibliography take the following form: surname(s) of author(s) (date: page(s)). If the book cited has more than one volume, then the number of the volume used each time follows the name of the author in Latin numerals. In cases where authors with the same surname appear in the same footnote, the initial of the author less cited always precedes his/her surname for purposes of convenience. The abbreviations of periodicals follow those of *L'Année philologique*. The abbreviations of editions used in the main text or the footnotes are noted in brackets when their full bibliographical reference is given.

The titles of the lost plays and the numbers of the fragments cited from *TrGF* are edited as found there. When appropriate, the number of a fragment is preceded by the symbol * to suggest that the assignement to the tragedy is conjectural. In other cases, the number of a fragment or the title of a play is preceded by **, indicating that the assignment to Aischylos is tentative.

Internal cross-references are by simple page number.

The underscore used occasionally in texts replaces the underdot of the editions and indicates the uncertainty of the reading of a letter.

Introduction

1. *The Aischylean corpus: loss and survival*

According to the *Souda*, Aischylos was in his mid-twenties when he first took part in the theatre contest in the year 498 B.C. and, according to the *Marmor Parium* (A50), written in the mid-third century B.C., his first victory came about fourteen years later, in 484 B.C. For his surviving plays the following dates are securely attested: 472 B.C. for the *Persai*,[1] 467 B.C. for the *Seven*,[2] and 458 B.C. for his last trilogy, the *Oresteia*,[3] which was written just two years before the death of the poet at Gela. There have been suggestions for the date of the *Hiketides* based on papyrological and internal evidence but these cannot be verified.[4] There is no attested evidence for the date of the *Prometheus* and additionally the research of the twentieth century tends to question its authenticity, thus raising the possibility that the total surviving Aischylean corpus consists of just six plays.[5]

Apparently, Aischylos was active in the theatre for a period of forty years from his first presentation in 498 B.C. to his last in 458 B.C. His oldest surviving tragedy is dated twenty-six years after the beginning of his career and the intervening years are blank. This is an important creative period for the poet, in which many changes took place that

---

[1] See the argument in MPVQKR.

[2] See the argument in M and P. Oxy. 2256. fr. 2.

[3] See the argument in MGFV.

[4] See discussions in Garvie (1969: 1-28); Friis Johansen and Whittle i (1980: 21-9); Scullion (2002: 87-90; 101); Sandin (2003: 1-4) in relation to the possible connection between P. Oxy. 2256. fr. 3 (*TrGF* iii *testimonium* Gk70), internal evidence and the date of the play.

[5] It is beyond the scope of this study to address this issue. For a detailed discussion and further bibliography, see Griffith (1977).

determined the nature of tragedy, such as the addition of the second actor and the introduction of the scenery (cf. *Vita* 53-9 and Arist. *Po.* 1449a 14-30). Furthermore, the surviving plays of Aischylos chronologically cover only partially the second part of his career and correspond to not more than four actual participations in theatrical contests.

Additional evidence that is given by the *Vita*, as found in M, and the *Souda* lexicon attests seventy-five and ninety plays respectively. The Catalogue of plays, which follows the *Vita*, includes seventy-three titles and makes no distinction between tragic and satyr plays, as well as no reference to trilogies and is organised not chronologically but alphabetically.[6] It also omits certain plays, which are attested as Aischylean by other sources.[7] This discrepancy between the sources raises questions. Could twenty-five extra plays be assigned to Aischylos by the time the *Souda* lexicon was written in the tenth century A.D.? Were these plays authentic, or were they *pseudepigrapha*? The existence of *pseudepigrapha* plays appears not to have been unique or strange.[8]

Whichever figure we accept for Aischylos' plays, the indisputable fact is that, even if we accept the lower figure for Aischylos' total output provided by the *Vita*, we still possess

[6] For efforts to explain this discrepancy with the suggestion for the existence of a fifth column of the catalogue that was lost and all relevant bibliography, see Gantz (1979).

[7] For other titles occasionally assigned to Aischylos in various *testimonia*, see Gantz (1979: 210; 212).

[8] Gottschalk (1980: 136) notes the case of a play by a forger that was assigned to Sophokles by Heraklides of Pontus as early as the fourth century B.C. The anecdote that Heraklides refused to correct his mistake, even when the forger proved his authorship with an acrostic, is indicative.

less than 10% of the Aischylean corpus and this chronologically reflects only the second half of his career.

2. *The tragedies of Aischylos on Troy*

From the vast number of fragmentary plays the current study focuses on the Aischylean tragedies deriving from the epic cycle on the Trojan war as narrated in the *Kypria*, the *Iliad*, the *Aithiopis* and the *Little Iliad*. The tragedies to be discussed are the *Palamedes*, the *Telephos*, the *Iphigeneia*, the *Myrmidones*, the *Nereides*, the *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra*, the *Hoplon Krisis*, the *Threissai*, the *Salaminiai*, the *Memnon*, the *Psychostasia* and the *Kares/Europe*.[9] The absence of Aischylean material for the actual fall of Troy should be noted unless more evidence comes to light. This is all the more interesting if with Aischylos' oeuvre one contrasts Euripides' *Hekabe* and *Troades*.

Despite the fact that the plays on Odysseus and the *Oresteia* would naturally complete this story and therefore this study, the former originating from the *Odyssey* and the latter from the *Nostoi*, they are not included for pragmatic reasons of space. It was our choice to combine as many tragedies as possible from as many epics as possible. However,

[9] The existence of two more titles that are not included in the Catalogue, but are attested only once under Aischylos' name- *Aias Lokros* (*TrGF* iii p. 125) and [***Alexandros*] (*TrGF* iii p. 130)- is considered improbable and the plays will not be discussed in the current study. The former could reflect confusion with the homonymous play of Sophokles (cf. *TrGF* iv fr. 15). Given the lack of evidence for the latter, it is not improbable that it could refer to the early years of Paris' life and not necessarily to the Trojan war. There are two more titles suggested by modern scholars for Aischylos, although there is not a single indication from antiquity supporting their existence. The titles are edited in *TrGF* as ***Ten(n)es?* (*TrGF* iii p. 343) and ***Kyknos?* (*TrGF* iii p. 230). These are also considered improbable. For the *Tennes*, see, also p. 229, n. 38.

reference will be made to the *Oresteia*,[10] as the only extant Aischylean trilogy and the only surviving example in the Aischylean corpus of bringing the epic story of Troy on stage.

The first reason for this choice of the Troajn cycle is that the story of the fall of Troy is one of the best known stories in Greek mythology and was repeatedly retold; this enables us to trace many of its constituent elements. It is accordingly easier to reconstruct previous and later versions than in the case of less well-known myths and so one can determine with more certainty the level of originality in any one version. Secondly, the tragedies chosen are all pieces of the same puzzle and we are given the opportunity to discuss a connected story in its episodes, even though one need not necessarily presuppose or determine the other.

Lastly, bearing in mind the possibility that some of these traditionally epic stories were possibly first put on stage by Aischylos, they become a significant link between epos and theatre.[11] Aischylos was, as far as we know, the only tragedian to write three plays deriving from the *Iliad*. In this respect Aischylos opposes a trend noted by Aristoteles (*Po.* 59a30) in that he competes with Homer on his own ground.[12] This is the only example we have of generic competition between a surviving epic poem and tragedy as

[10] See pp. 34-44.

[11] The coincidence of content between the two genres is made evident as early as Aristoteles (*Po.* 1459b.1ff.). The titles that Aristoteles lists are probably not tragedies but rather episodes or themes. See Else (1957: 590-3); Lucas (1968: 218).

[12] See Herington (1985: 140), who considers this attempt of Aischylos to be the most risky of all.

well as a good exemplar of authorial competition between two of the greatest poets of antiquity.

3. *Objective of the present study*

The aim of the current study is to examine collectively the way that the Trojan war story was told by Aischylos. The reconstruction of the plays that is attempted in the study is not detailed because of the fragility and the paucity of the evidence (for example, there is only one line surviving from the *Iphigeneia*). The objective, therefore, is not to reconstruct the plot structure and performance of the tragedies, although this is partially and occasionally done to the extent needed to recreate the stories and investigate the Aischylean approach to them.

We examine the originality of the tragedian in relation to the existing epic telling of the stories; whether he repeated or reshaped these stories and how faithful he was to the epic material in his thematic emphasis, the inclusion or exclusion of characters already in the story, the invention of new characters and the conduct of the characters, the creation of new incidents and the emotional dynamics. Moreover, we examine the adjustment of the epic stories and the characters to the value system of Aischylos' own era and the interaction with the ideas, social structures, culture and politics of fifth-century Athens. The importance of generic competition (in relation to epos, lyric and other genres) as a motivating force behind these changes is also investigated. Furthermore, we explore the influence of Aischylos' intervention in this much-narrated story in order to determine,

where possible, his impact on subsequent tragedy and how this was formed through the inter-generic competition among fifth-century tragedians.

Where relevant, this study also examines questions of authenticity. In some cases doubts are raised about the authenticity of plays or fragments assigned to Aischylos, as is the case with *TrGF* iii fr. **99 and the *Kares/Europe* and a number of fragments often assigned by modern researchers to the *Myrmidones*.

The current study avoids excessive engagement in debates concerning suggested connections of plays in trilogies. Reliable evidence for Aischylean trilogies – as against modern conjectural reconstructions – is in fact very limited. The trilogy comprising of the *Agamemnon*, the *Choephoroi* and the *Eumenides*,[13] alongside the trilogy of the *Laios*, the *Oidipous* and the *Seven*, form two attested trilogies with an apparent narrative connection, where each event causes the next to happen (cf. Arist. *Po.* 1450a-1451a). There have also been suggestions on how the plays of the Danaid trilogy (*TrGF* iii *testimonium* Gk 70) might have been connected.[14] The existence of the *Lykourgeia* (*TrGF* iii *testimonium* Gi 67-9) opens up the possibility of different kinds of linkage.[15] The trilogy including the *Persai* proves that there could be Aischylean trilogies with no narrative connection between their plays.

[13] See Garvie (1986: 26-8 intro.), who discusses the connections between the plays of the *Oresteia* trilogy.

[14] For a discussion on the trilogy of the Danaids and reconstruction attempts of the fragmentary plays, see Garvie (1969: 163-235).

[15] Note that West (1983: 63-71) attempts a reconstruction of the four plays of the *Lykourgeia*, which he considers to be thematically connected. See, also, Lloyd-Jones (1971: 90).

It is highly likely that the fragmentary remains include some trilogies and attempts have frequently been made to reconstruct trilogic connections,[16] either by dramatising an extended action centred on a single person or group, or linking plays presented together narratively, with a continuous plot, as if these are three acts of a single play. There is no secure evidence for any of them, even the ones which are widely accepted today, and some researchers are understandably dismissive of attempts to reconstruct trilogies on such scarce evidence.[17] Among the proposed trilogies are the three plays on Achilleus (the *Myrmidones*, the *Nereides* and the *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra*) and the three plays on Aias (the *Hoplon Krisis*, the *Threissai* and the *Salaminiai*). There is no compelling evidence against these groupings but equally the evidence used to verify them is slender. There are slightly more problems with a third suggested trilogy, which has also been often taken for granted: the *Kares/Europe*, the *Memnon* and the *Psychostasia* (cf. pp. 183-5). The existence of connected trilogies such as the *Oresteia*, though, suggests that it is worth asking the question for the lost plays as well, even if no conclusion can be reached on the existing evidence.

4. *Methodology*

Working with fragments can be both fascinating and frustrating. The dead ends that one encounters are many. It is preferable to start with the detailed interrogation of the fragments of the plays themselves, though there is always the danger of reading too little

[16] For approaches to earlier attempts for reconstructions, see Gantz (1980a: 301-4) and for a categorisation between more or less probable cases of trilogies, see Gantz (1980b: 142-63). For other groupings of Aischylean plays into trilogies, see Ferrari (1982: 154-7); Sommerstein (1996: 56-63).

[17] Taplin (1977: 195-6).

or too much into what is really there. The corroborative use and convergence of other sources is an important means of checking the authenticity, the attribution of a fragment to a play, the accuracy of the quote, the paraphrase or the reference. Although convergence is not conclusive, it does increase our confidence. A case where convergence of sources increases confidence in a reconstruction is that of Telephos holding baby Orestes without threatening him. This scene is found in a scholion, on a vase, and has a parallel in the homonymous Euripidean tragedy where Telephos is threatening the child. In addition there are certain other historical parallels, as well (cf. pp. 270-3). Furthermore, we place the pre-Aischylean tradition in relation to the Aischylean as far as stories are concerned and we note cases of divergence, of possible influence or of new elements. We also check the origin, often in relation to fifth-century Athens, and the function of these new elements.

Dramaturgy also helps us to answer questions. The restrictions of drama and the new potential it allows (as noted in pp. 32-3) are taken into account. The stagecraft of Aischylos is not our main concern but one needs to keep in mind that the fragments of Aischylos are still drama and there are questions to be answered like the presentation of a *psychostasia* or of the weighing of the body of Hektor on stage. One thing that is taken into account is the diversity attested, as far as dramaturgy is concerned, in the surviving corpus of Aischylos.

The comparison of evidence with the surviving plays of Aischylos is a key means of verification. The small proportion of the corpus extant and the fact that the surviving

plays come relatively late in the Aischylean corpus does not allow one to exclude things simply because they diverge from Aischylean practices, but confidence is increased where a proposed reconstruction can be paralleled with Aischylean practice. There are certain marks of Aischylos that could be indicative but one should be extremely cautious. Furthermore, consistency is essential in the way in which one approaches fragments and the same criteria should always be applied for the proposal of a stable hypothesis.

Conjecture is the last resort; but it is the connecting link between all of the above and all that follows in this study. Working with fragments inevitably calls for conjecture. Even though maximum use is made of solid evidence, imaginative leaps are the only way to proceed if we are to progress beyond the actual few lines of a fragment and attempt to see the larger picture. Such conjecture will inevitably leave room for debate. But reasoned conjecture tested by debate has a very important role to play in the world of classical studies, since the possibility of shedding light to the larger picture, even to the smallest extent, is worth the effort and the risk.

5. *Material and problems*

The sources used to examine the Aischylean transformation of the epic stories into tragedy are fragments, *testimonia*, literary sources and occasionally iconographical sources along with information for fifth-century Athenian history, politics, institutions and trends. This material is, in many cases and to different extents, problematic.

5.1 *Fragments*

The amount of surviving fragments for each tragedy varies. The *verbatim* fragments of the tragedies in question are not more than seventy, amounting approximately to one hundred and seventy lines. The distribution among tragedies varies from the *Iphigeneia*, which has only one fragment of a single line, to the *Myrmidones*, which has sixteen fragments and circa eighty lines. The origin of the fragments is another troubling issue. There are two categories: the papyrus fragments and the fragments quoted by other writers. The former category most frequently raises doubts about attribution, since the name of the play or the author is almost never mentioned and researchers have to resort to conjecture. The current study accepts as Aischylean those fragments where a strong case can be made for Aischylean authorship and attribution to the play in question; the strength of the case is evaluated where doubts have been raised.

As far as the fragments quoted are concerned, one must always remember that the quoting was done by writers of different ages, for different purposes and with variable credibility.[18] Each writer cites parts of Aischylos to make a point for his argument, and it is therefore possible that the fragment or its context has been misunderstood even if its correct reading is preserved. West notes that distortions of quotation passages could alternatively be due to inaccurate memory, an intermediary source, orthographical modernisation, emendations by scribes and scholars, haplography, dittography, omission, glosses that were eventually inserted from margins into texts, Christian zeal (replacement of θεοί with θεός), or the excerpter could even be serving the purposes of an anthology

[18] Most (1997: 6-7) suggests that the reason for quoting and the character of the quoter should be given special attention.

that needed passages to be self-contained.[19] It should be noted that the accuracy of fragments that are only attested once cannot be checked. It is also indicative that the list of quoters includes names as distant, and not only chronologically, as Aristophanes and Maximos Planoudes.

5.2 *Testimonia*

The *testimonia* vary as far as their context is concerned. Some refer, for example, to the dramaturgy of a tragedy, others to the plot or the characters of a play. The size of the *testimonia* can also vary significantly; among the largest cases are the discourse of Dion on the Philoktetes plays and the long passage in Aristophanes- the *agon* between Aischylos and Euripides (*Ra.* 757-1530). But, equally, there are *testimonia* that can be significant and only one line long. The list of writers giving details about plays is again as large and as miscellaneous as the list of those citing fragments. The reason for mentioning each *testimonium* is very important because it may be even more dangerous or biased than *verbatim* quotations of a tragedy. Some of the *testimonia* are comparative (Dion) and some are humorous (Aristophanes),[20] and in any case the prism of the quoter can distort what we perceive as Aischylean. Dion could plausibly accentuate differences between the plays which he discusses with the purpose to make his point clear and Aristophanes, for example, could exaggerate certain Aischylean trends in order to provoke the laughter of his audience. The authorship of Aischylos is most usually attested in these *testimonia* and, occasionally, the title of the play to which a *testimonium*

[19] West (1973: 15-29).

[20] See Dover (1987: 195-6), for a discussion on Aristophanes' use of tragedy in his plays.

refers is mentioned. Some of these *testimonia* have proved reliable when juxtaposed with other sources, while the authority of others is more questionable.[21]

5.3 *Literary sources*

The current study examines all known literary sources that were available to Aischylos as far as the story of Troy was concerned. This is done in order to identify the elements which pre-existed in myth and to understand the extent to which these influenced the poet. Consequently, this helps us determine the degree of originality of the Aischylean adaptation of a myth.

Inevitably the reconstruction of epic sources is critical to our research. The epic songs determined to some degree the content of all subsequent genres and this pattern was intensified as the living oral tradition that gave birth to the epic tales was gradually coming to an end.[22] Among all other genres, epos was considered to be specially related to tragedy. Aristoteles (*Po.* 1448b.28-1449a.6; cf. Pl. *R.* 595C; cf. 605D; 607A and *Tht.* 152E) notes the generic relationship between 'Homer' and both tragedy (*Iliad* and *Odyssey*) and comedy (*Margites*). Homer is thus presented as the spiritual father of drama.[23] For ancient readers the affinity of the work of Aischylos with the epic cycle was particularly pronounced, according to Athenaios (8.347D / *TrGF* iii *testimonium* O112a.4-6):

---

[21] One such problematic scholion (schol. A. *Pr.* 441) has been used to suggest Talthybios' presence in the *Myrmidones*. See pp. 113-4.

[22] Burgess (2001: 44; 132).

[23] Else (1957: 146-7).

> τὸ τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ λαμπροῦ Αἰσχύλου, ὃς τὰς αὑτοῦ τραγῳδίας τεμάχη εἶναι ἔλεγεν τῶν Ὁμήρου μεγάλων δείπνων.

Although there is no reason to suppose that this apocryphal quotation originates with Aischylos, it is useful evidence for the reception and evaluation of the poet.[24]

The epic sources bring a fresh set of problems. The surviving fragments from most poems are few and Proklos, our main witness, does not offer any details about the episodes as his account is highly condensed because of the vast amount of epic material that he had to summarise. As a result, though we can rely on positive statements by Proklos, one cannot argue from silence in Proklos for the absence of a theme in epic. An additional problem is that the epics, in some cases at least, extended originally beyond the boundaries that Proklos sets in the summaries.[25] This happens because the concept of an epic cycle did not exist originally and the variant poems were unconnected and autonomous and, as a result, they occasionally covered partly the same material. The manipulation of the reportage of the poems to form a cycle probably occurred in the Hellenistic age.[26] Another problem is the dating of the epic poems. [27]

---

[24] It should be noted that as in many cases in antiquity Homer stands for the whole of the epic cycle. See Shapiro (1994: 124); Graziosi (2002: 193-9).

[25] Burgess (2001: 134).

[26] Burgess (2001: 8).

[27] Bernabé (1987: 43; 69; 76; 89; 95) dates the *Kypria*, the *Aithiopis*, the *Little Iliad*, the *Iliou Persis* and the *Nostoi* between the end of the eighth and the seventh century B.C. Davies (1989: 2-5), on the other hand, allows the possibility of a considerably later dating.

The Hesiodic *Katalogos* is another source, but its fragmentary nature makes it a problematic source of information. Hesiod was one of Aischylos' influences,[28] but was pseudo-Hesiod as well?[29] Lyric poetry is equally problematic. Lyric poets worked extensively on the story of Troy and there are indications that some of the versions which they created were very influential.[30] Stesichoros was very close to epos and has often been considered epico-lyric because of his epic contents, the length of his poems, the (Doricised) epic literary dialect and the dactylo-anapaestic metre that he used.[31] It is very difficult, however, to recover extensive information about his treatment of the Trojan war from his *Oresteia* (A-B),[32] *Helene* or *Iliou Persis*.[33] Evidence has furthermore been suggested for traces of probable influence between Aischylos and Archilochos, at least as far as the *Oresteia* is concerned.[34] We know, furthermore, that many dithyrambs were

---

[28] Hesiod's influence on the extant plays of Aischylos has been examined by Solmsen, who notes e.g. that the Erinyes in the *Oresteia* preserve the genealogy created for them in the *Theogonia*. See Solmsen (1949: 181).

[29] West (1985: 127; 130-7); Hirschberger (2004: 42-51) discuss the authenticity and the date of the *Katalogos*, which they place in the sixth century B.C.

[30] This influence is also evident on art. For Séchan (1926: 26), Stesichoros is considered to be the mind behind the presentation of Herakles in lion-skin and holding a bow. See, also, Robertson (1969: 207-221). See, moreover, Shapiro (1994: 109ff.) for Bakkhylides' version of the myth of Theseus with reference to poems 17 and 18 and iconography.

[31] Russo (1999: 339-40). Also Russo (*ibid.*: 345) sees Stesichoros as a case of late revival of an early and pre-homeric epic. See West (1971: 314).

[32] For his *Oresteia* and the innovations that he inserted in the story and that in turn influenced tragedy and Aischylos in specific, there is the testimony of an important text (*PMG* 217). See pp. 35; 286.

[33] See, moreover, Thalmann (1982: 385-91), who suggests that the lot motif and the equal shares between the brothers in the *Seven* of Aischylos indicate the influence of Stesichoros' lost poem on the story (cf. *PMGF* 222b).

[34] See West (1979: 1-6); Janko (1980: 291-3).

written on the story of the Trojan war.[35] It is noteworthy that among those who presented dithyrambs at Athens were names such as Pindar, Simonides and Bakkhylides.[36] Aischylos would probably have the opportunity to be part of the audience that watched Bakkhylides, Pindar,[37] or Simonides competing at Athens, and, moreover, he could have met the latter at the court of Hieron in Sicily (cf. Plu. *Cim.* 8; Paus. 1.2.3).

Our evidence for early tragedy is even more limited. From the late sixth century, the works of Thespis, Choirilos and Phrynichos functioned in Athens not only as a means of entertainment and education but also as a guide to aspirant poets, such as the young Aischylos, and as a measure of comparison.[38] Aischylos will certainly have watched some of Phrynichos' plays and probably attended at least some of the late sixth century performances. However, we should not expect any influence to have left a trace in our secondary sources.

The question of whether anyone even in the fifth century could sing a song or quote from a speech by Thespis cannot be answered. Aristoteles in the fourth century presents gaps in his knowledge of earlier tragedy and resorts to hypothetical reconstruction for the early

---

[35] See Sutton (1989: 121-2).

[36] Pickard-Cambridge (1953: 76). On the closeness between epos and Bakkhylides, see Segal (1977: 100-1).

[37] See Finley (1955: 179-288, esp. 283-88), for a parallel discussion of Aischylos' surviving plays and Pindar.

[38] The following dates are attested but their accuracy is doubted: 535/3 B.C. for Thespis' first production, 523/0 for Choirilos' first production and 511/8 for Phrynichos' first production. West (1989: 254) suggests that we can only be certain that Phrynichos was somewhat older than Aischylos, Choirilos was older still and that Thespis started his career when Peisistratos was in power. See also Scullion (2002: 81-4).

history of tragedy.[39] We have only few testimonies for the themes and material that these old poets used,[40] but the *Souda* mentions almost two hundred plays as the number of the total production of these early poets, and this allows plenty of scope for speculation.

The *testimonium* in the argument of the *Persai* of Aischylos in relation to the *Phoinissai* of Phrynichos is of major importance (*Persai argumentum* 1-7), as far as the intertextuality between the two poets is concerned. Though isolated, this example is very important as evidence of the influence of earlier tragedy on Aischylos. It is not improbable that more allusions were to be found in the plays of Aischylos to his predecessors, however little is discernible today.

5.4 *Iconographical sources*

This is one of the most problematic sources, not because of lack of material, as in most of the other cases, but because of the difficulty in deciphering the material as well as establishing and evaluating connections between the vases and the plays. This is even more difficult when there is nothing to imply that a vase was influenced by the theatre to begin with. There is a great debate concerning vases and their sources in the last decades. Can the vases help us reconstruct a play? Can they give us details of the play or verify episodes and characters, for example? Different researchers would provide different answers to the above questions.

---

[39] Griffith (1977: 239); Lucas (1968: 79-80).

[40] For the few surviving titles and *testimonia* of early tragedy, see *TrGF* i 1 (Thespis) *testimonia* 1-24, frs. 1-5; *TrGF* i 2 (Choirilos) *testimonia* 1-10, frs. 1-5; *TrGF* i 3 (Phrynichos) *testimonia* 1-17, frs. 1-24; *TrGF* i 4 (Pratinas) *testimonia* 1-8, frs. 1-9.

Before we continue, a basic classification between vases should be attempted. There are two categories of vases: those which acknowledge theatrical influence and others that show no relation to theatre although the stories which they depict were put on stage. Attic vases, for example, do not acknowledge their theatricality but south-Italian vases occasionally do.[41] On Attic vases there are usually no theatre trappings, no costume-like clothes and no mask-like faces.[42] As a result, it is always hazardous to connect an Attic vase to a performance of a play, even when you can securely connect it to a story.[43] Even so, it is not improbable that the theatre played a role in inspiring iconography in Athens,[44] but it is not at all certain if there is any way of getting beyond conjecture.

There have been suggestions that Attic vase-painters could occasionally imitate the elements of a story that made an impression on them. These could perhaps be new elements in the story, like a poet's innovations. For example, certain elements novel to the traditional telling of a story, which are occasionally assigned to Aischylos, make their presence on vases of the first half of the fifth century B.C. Such is the case of the cloaked Achilleus confronting Odysseus, the second arming of Achilleus with the Nereids present and the suicide of Aias with the sword entering his armpit. These details could point divergence from established tradition and might help us in our attempt to

[41] Taplin (1993: 7) and (1997: 88); Small (2003: 52).

[42] There are at least two exceptions from the fifth century, however. For more, see Green (1991: 34-5) and (1994: 17-8, fig. 2.1); Taplin (1997: 69-71); Small (2003: 37-8, pl. 18).

[43] Taplin (1997: 72).

[44] Taplin (1993: 27-8).

relate an image to an attested version of a specific poet.[45] This is, of course, more difficult than expected, especially when working with fragmentary plays and Attic vases that do not directly acknowledge any theatrical influence.

The picture is different for Italy. There are south-Italian vases that do imply their theatrical influences: they present mythical stories with characters in costumes, masks, *aedicula* and more.[46] The undoubted influence of tragedy on the theatre of Megale Hellas,[47] is also visible in south-Italian iconography.[48] Nevertheless, there is no unanimity on establishing connections between these vases and the plays and no secure way to approach the issue has yet been established: the number of south-Italian vases that researchers connect to performances of specific plays varies from more than a hundred to only three.[49]

There are in fact many problems related to iconographical sources, both Attic and south-Italian, and one should be very cautious. The example of the Attic Boston *Oresteia* crater

[45] Small (2003: 29) speaks of the salient detail that can connect the vase to a literary source.

[46] Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 5).

[47] Note that Taplin (1998: 39) concludes that a successful play in Athens might be re-produced in south-Italian theatre within a small period of time (twenty, perhaps even ten years).

[48] Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 5-6). Moreover, Kossatz-Deissmann (*ibid.*: 7-9) notes the special interest for Aischylos, who visited Sicily and died there.

[49] Séchan (1926) worked extensively to establish connections between a large number of vases, both Attic and south-Italian, and plays. Trendall and Webster (1971) also connected a number of vases to theatre. Taplin (1993: 27) and (1997: 90) speaks of a rich body of material from south-Italy, more than a hundred vases, that should be examined in relation to theatre. Small (2003: 53) accepts only three cases of south-Italian vases that can be related to specific tragedies.

(*LIMC* Agamemnon 89; Aigisthos 10) which is dated to 470 B.C.,[50] predating the *Oresteia* of Aischylos, proves that researchers were initially wrong to see the vase as the result of the trilogy of 458 B.C.[51] On the contrary, the vase proves that certain elements that were widely believed to be the innovation of Aischylos, such as the net used in Agamemnon's killing, actually predated his *Oresteia*.[52] The Boston *Oresteia* crater is a reminder of the limits of our knowledge, especially with most of the production of Athenian theatre lost or preserved in fragmentary form.

There is no doubt that literary sources, with tragedy being one of these, would probably be among the elements that would contribute to the fused supply of memories from which an artist would compose his final image. But the artists had more than one source available and they could be influenced by other painters, as well.[53] The classical view of flexibility of myths, as is evident from the work of the three tragedians on the same stories, should also be taken into account.[54] Even if an artist was inspired by a performance, he would not be obliged to do a one-to-one correspondence between the performance and the vase.[55] It is not improbable that sometimes the painters would innovate or would combine elements from various sources. They could add characters that were not taking part in the action of a play but were simply referred to, or present together characters appearing in different episodes of a play. They could sometimes turn

[50] Gais *LIMC* i (1981: 373); Webster (1962: 137); March (1987: 96); Prag (1985: 25).

[51] Vermeule (1966: 1-22, pll. 1-8).

[52] Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 89-90); March (1987: 95-6, n. 69) sees the influence of Simonides on the vase.

[53] Small (2003: 6, 21).

[54] Small (2003: 78).

[55] Barringer (1995: 22).

narrative found in tragedies into action, and this would result in the presentation of characters or episodes on vases that may not have been presented on stage.[56] South-Italian vases are not scene-specific, for example, even though they clearly present stage action, and this complicates considerably our research.[57] There is also the question of the degree to which there could have been entirely original inventions by the painters. It is also necessary not to dismiss another important possibility: that visual art and literature, in some cases, mutually responded to cultural changes. All of the above would make, for some, the task of securely connecting a play to a vase futile. In the end, one can only be brave enough to make an assumption and cautious enough to test the conjecture against other evidence and then accept the inevitable and proper debate.

On the other hand, there is the possibility that certain images existed in art before they were taken up by a tragedian. We must not ignore iconography as a possible means of inspiration for a poet. Séchan noted cases of images that pre-existed in art before their presentation in Aischylos such as the *kerostasia/psychostasia*, Eos carrying the body of her son Memnon and the silent persons in grief, wearing a mantle.[58] The relationship between visual art and tragedy seems to have been reciprocal, and this is reasonable since tragedy was a genre whose characteristic difference was the use not only of words but of images, as well.

To conclude, with all of the related reservations, one cannot ignore the probability that art might have reflected stories that made an impression on contemporary theatre and its

[56] Taplin (1993: 27); Green (1999: 44).

[57] See Taplin (1993: 27), who notes two exceptions.

[58] Séchan (1926: 11-16).

audience, which would include both the vase-painters and their clients. This influence of tragedy on iconography takes a different form in Attica than it does in the Greek cities of south Italy. Conjecture combined with critical evaluation of the evidence is the only method we can approach the relationship between vases and theatre, while always allowing a large margin for error.

5.5 *Athens: a vital source of inspiration*

Aischylos used the mythical stories that he and his fellow-citizens had grown up with as a basis to create his art. To this mythological foundation he added elements coming from his real-life experiences as an individual with a personal story, as an active citizen of a *polis*, as a soldier in times of war, as a Greek, therefore non-barbarian, and many more qualities. There is one undeniable piece of evidence that Aischylos was influenced by his contemporary environment and that he could occasionally transform this influence into a sometimes very powerful drama: the *Persai*. In the rest of his surviving plays, all revolving around mythical stories, there are several examples of contemporary elements inserted that are noted by researchers.

These new contemporary elements in the work of Aischylos are unlike the so-called 'anachronisms' that sometimes, mostly accidentally, might slip into the work of a poet. A pyre replacing an inhumation in Homer, for example, might be unintentional but the *Areopagos* addition to the *Oresteia* story is certainly intentional.[59] In Aischylos, as

[59] Antiquity apparently failed to make the distinction; a scholiast on Euripides (schol. *Hec.* 254) refers to anachronism as a common mistake of the poet: ἔστι τοιοῦτος ὁ Εὐριπίδης περιάπτων τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸν τοῖς ἥρωσι καὶ τοὺς χρόνους συγχέων.

elsewhere in tragedy, the contemporary references are not fortuitous, they are deliberate and, occasionally, they are extensive. Sometimes they determine the plot, they change the traditional story and they can even become the focal point of the action.

While there is not much disagreement on the existence of such elements (the Areopagos is an evident example that is later discussed), there is great divergence in discussions on the motives of the poet when inserting contemporary material. Political motives -often contrasting ones, propaganda, jingoism- have all been repeatedly part of the discussion on Aischylos' motives. In our opinion, contemporary elements in Aischylos need not always or solely have the function of sustaining or opposing fifth-century politics, parties or politicians. On the contrary, the way in which Aischylos merges in his plays the mythical and the contemporary world goes deeper and in more directions than political motives can sufficiently explain.

As will be seen when discussing specific plays, Aischylos' contemporary material comes from the historical, social, cultural and political sphere of fifth-century Athens. In his plays there are allusions to political or legal institutions that determined life in the city, references to specific laws and an accurate and sometimes speedy adaptation of legal procedures in mythical stories, elements related to the funerary customs of the time, characteristics of the immigrants residing in the city, knowledge of the barbarian, and cultural trends of the time. In combining components from myth and reality, Aischylos is apparently anticipating his audience's knowledge of both the myth and of this contemporary material. He is actually building on his fellow-citizens' real-life

experiences, their memory and their sentimental world. His fifth-century innovations in the stories are meant to create a special interest to his audience, or better to renew their interest for the long-repeated story that they were now watching in theatre (this is further discussed in pp. 304-10). To this direction, we examine historical sources and ancient *testimonia* for life in Athens of the fifth century, as well as *testimonia* in relation to Aischylos.

5.6 *Reception*

Reception is used in this study both as evidence of the material that the poet was making use of and, primarily, as evidence of his impact (cf. pp. 311-19). Aischylos created a whole new corpus that remained at the disposal of future poets, both through revivals (cf. pp. 313-4) as well as, later, through texts.[60] In later drama, both Greek and Roman, there is evidence about plays homonymous with certain plays of Aischylos. These dramas are in most cases fragmentary and one checks the possibility of Aischylean influence from the fragments surviving and the *testimonia*. The influence can take the form of repetition, evident omission or rejection of elements that Aischylos used, or invented, in his version. This does not imply that there were only linear ways of influence between the poets, however. A number of other influences, as well as inter-generic rivalry, are important in understanding the associations between the works of fifth-century tragedians (cf. p. 311).

[60] Thomas (1989: 19) disagrees with the hypothesis of a general distribution of books even in late fifth century B.C; Turner (1952: 21-2) suggests that the trade of books in Athens at the time was a modest one and that the knowledge of earlier plays that the Athenians had was that of the theatre-goer and not that of the reader (cf. Ar. *Ra.* 1028-9; *PCG* fr. 696); Csapo-Slater (1995: 1) suggest that book trade was in its infancy during Euripides' career and was established in the very last years of the fifth century.

As material, however, the reception of Aichylean innovations in the work of other poets can sometimes verify things or increase our confidence.

6. *Why study the fragmentary tragedies?*

So little survives from the work of the three tragedians in relation to the attested extent of their corpus that whatever we have should be considered precious regardless of its small quantity. The case is even more pressing for Aischylos and Sophokles, each represented by the late Byzantine period by only seven surviving plays.

Examination of the evidence for the lost plays can expand our research range and open the horizons for a fuller and more complex image of the poet. At the very least it could, for instance, illuminate the poet's choices of stories from traditional sagas - in fact even the titles of lost plays provide an insight into his selected themes. An examination of the fragments of and *testimonia* for the lost plays can also shed light on a poet's artistic practices and dramaturgy and reveal similarities with the surviving plays or unearth tantalising differences. For example, one can look for certain techniques of a poet, like Aischylos' typical use of delay to create suspense, and the silence of characters on stage.[61] Moreover, one finds in the fragmentary corpus other elements of the poet's art that can be paralleled with what we know from the surviving plays. One can sporadically spot references, in a variety of forms, to contemporary Athenian reality. In the fragmentary plays, moreover, one can find elements which are not found in surviving Aischylos such as indications of trials in the Athenian form (set speeches etc.), *agones*,

[61] See Goward (1999: 39ff.; 60-4), who notes narrative techniques of the poet such as delay, prophecies and dreams.

sentiments that never occupy centre stage in the extant plays (such as *phthonos*), strong erotic/sexual language, homosexual love and more. We can also identify instances of innovative treatment of traditional stories by the poet that would have been otherwise unknown. This opens up a window to the choices which the poet made when it came to well-known myths and the function of the new elements which he inserted, as well as the influence he had exercised through his innovations on later poets.

At the very least, study of the fragmentary tragedies has the salutary effect of underlining the extent of our ignorance and this realisation should perhaps prevent us from speaking with certainty about trends and habits of a poet. This is all the more important for Aischylos, because his fragmentary corpus in particular is not only smaller but it also remains an under-researched topic.

Generic and authorial competition: the quest for originality

Generic competition between tragedy and its sources would be inevitable. Epos and lyric, for example, would have long established some of their versions and their grip over audiences. Aischylos would have to make an effort for his tragedies to be able to measure up with the success of the other genres, especially when working on the same stories. The *Iliad* of Homer is the evident example in relation to the Achilleus plays of Aischylos but not the only one. The *Oresteia* (A-B) of Stesichoros could have been an equally strong contestant in relation to Aischylos' last trilogy.

There would, of course, be formative differences manifested between the new Athenian genre and all its predecessors: tragedy had the means to create live images and it involved live dialogue. Tragedy thus had a propinquity that the other genres lacked. Aischylos had the opportunity to create strong visual scenes out of well-known narrated scenes, such as, for example, the scene with Priamos kneeling in front of Achilleus in a formal supplication for the return of Hektor's corpse, and this would have a strong emotional effect on his audiences. Aischylos would, moreover, give a face and a voice, perhaps for the first time ever, to many of the characters (or people) that were known to the public only through narrations and iconography; in the case of the Trojans, for example, he gives them the face of the Persian enemies of Athens and their barbarian sounds, as far as their music and lamentation were concerned.

Some of the opportunities, as well as some of the restrictions of tragedy (e.g. no change of scene, restricted number of characters on stage), might have even inspired Aischylos

in certain cases to make an innovation. Many episodes of epos, for example, must be narrated in drama either in choral parts or in messenger speeches.[1] Moreover, some things simply do not work in tragedy; as Aristoteles notes (*Po.* 1460a), it would have been comical to present Hektor on stage running to escape from Achilleus as the *Iliad* has it.

There is another and more specific factor at work in this intertextual relationship: authorial competition. Aischylos encountered versions of the myths written by some of the greatest and most inventive poets of the archaic and early classical period: Homer, Stesichoros, Simonides and Pindar and he would have to create stories that could measure up against their established versions.

Inventiveness, perhaps the surprise of the audience, a new version deriving from older stories, would be the goal of the poet. Aischylos employed both his different genre and his talent to achieve success: he often magnified collisions, passions, pain and guilt as many of his choices in the plays discussed in the current study suggest. He preferred to paint the stories in impressive colours and often brought characters (and motives) from the background to the central stage in order to add to the drama. Moreover, he repeatedly inserted real-life contemporary elements which were, up to that point, completely irrelevant to the myth but could engage his audience, and these new elements occasionally became central parts of the myth thereafter.

[1] For messenger speeches and the possibilities they allow the poet, see pp. 78-9, nn. 72-3.

The example of the Oresteia

In any examination of the fragmentary plays on the story of Troy the *Oresteia* has an important role to play as the only extant example of how Aischylos told part of this story. The scope of this section is to explore briefly the degree of innovation in the *Oresteia* in relation to pre-existing tradition, the ways in which Aischylos re-determines the story by bringing forth less evident aspects of it or by inventing new elements, either by magnifying emotions and reactions or by blending the myth with fifth-century reality. Aischylos' treatment of the *Oresteia* myth had a huge impact on subsequent literature and art in general. There are, of course, numerous extensive discussions on the *Oresteia* and this brief treatment owes a lot to its predecessors. It is meant to serve as an indication of potential effects as we approach the fragmentary plays, not to offer a prescriptive model.[2]

In the sources predating Aischylos the story was already rich, with many characters and several details in existence. Usually the two accomplices, Aigisthos and Klytaimenstra, are joint partners in the murder of Agamemnon and more often than not the death of Aigisthos is the climax of Orestes' revenge (cf. *PEG Nostoi argumentum* 17-9; Hesiodic *Katalogos* fr. 23a.27-30 MW[3]; *Odyssey* 3.309-10). In Homer the story is briefly but repeatedly used as a paradigm which, depending on the speaker and the listener, is accordingly transformed: on occasion Klytaimnestra is isolated as the killer

[2] The *Oresteia* is also discussed in the *Iphigeneia* chapter and there are cross-references to the discussion there.

[3] The text is included in pp. 284-5.

of Agamemnon to serve as a contrast to Penelope.[4] In tradition the motive of Klytaimnestra is usually her adultery and her thirst for power until we come across a poem of Pindar. It is his version which relates the murder to the sacrifice of Iphigeneia for the first time, as far as we know (*P.* 11.22-6).[5] The brevity of the reference to Klytaimnestra, however, might imply the familiarity of the audience with such a version.[6] March suggests that another version intervened between Stesichoros and Pindar that brought Klytaimnestra and the sacrifice of Iphigeneia to the foreground of the action; in her view this would be Simonides (*PMG* 549; 608 fr. 1 (a) + 2).[7] There is no secure evidence, though.

It is clear that several minor characters and a number of details were included in the early versions of the story. For example, Elektra featured in the poetry of Xanthos (cf. *PMG* 700), Kassandra was present in epos (*Od.* 11.421-2) and both Chrysothemis and Talthybios are portrayed on an early vase (*LIMC* Aigisthos 6).[8] Stesichoros (*Oresteia* A-B; cf. *PMG* 217; 218) used the warning dream of Klytaimnestra, the hair as a means of recognition, the Furies as the pursuers of Orestes, the bow that Apollon gave to Orestes to protect himself against them, and the nurse, in this case named Laodameia.

---

[4] Kamerbeek (1974: 1); March (1987: 84-86) and (2001: 1-2); Garvie (1986: 9-10 intro.).

[5] The text is included in p. 286. The date of the poem has been considered to be more probably the year 474, and not the year 454 B.C. that was occasionally suggested. See the discussion in p. 286, n. 6.

[6] March (1987: 91).

[7] March (1987: 97-8). The text of *PMG* 608 fr. 1 (a) + 2 is included in pp. 287-8.

[8] Gais *LIMC* i (1981: 373) dates the vase (a red-figure pelike of the Berlin painter) to 500 B.C. See, moreover, Beazley (1963: 204, 109).

The Oresteia Boston crater, which is later discussed, suggests that a detail such as the net used in the murder of Agamemnon was already part of the story before Aischylos.[9]

Apparently, when Aischylos decides to write a trilogy on the story in 458 B.C., it is already a rich account with several critical details in existence. Aischylos gives it, however, a decisive turn: Klytaimnestra is not only in the foreground of the killing but she is transformed into a colossal figure, unlike any other attested occasion in the history of this myth. She becomes the main murderer, she is presented with male characteristics and Aigisthos is simply her weak and feminised accomplice.[10] Her motive is plainly related to the death of Iphigeneia, whose salvation is silenced in the *parodos* of the *Agamemnon* (cf. *A.* 248). Furthermore, it is Klytaimnestra's death which becomes the peak of the action in the *Choephoroi* and the matricide is central to the trilogy as a whole.

Apparently Aischylos has chosen between versions and selected one which places the emphasis firmly on Klytaimnestra; as well as allowing him one of his greatest character creations, his choice is also used as the basis for an explicit and extensive major theme running through the trilogy and culminating in the trial scene in the *Eumenides* – gender inversion. So the change is of strategic importance.[11] Aischylos' use of

[9] See p. 25.

[10] See p. 301.

[11] Thematic changes like this are good parallels for some of the effects in the lost plays, as well, such as the way in which the *Myrmidones* explores the relationship between a leader and his *laos*. See p. 118.

Klytaimnestra was, in short, one of the main innovations that re-invented a story well-known at the time.[12]

Part of the success of the *Oresteia* has to do with the creation or clearer presentation of the deeper feelings that lead to the characters' actions. For example, Klytaimnestra's maternal feelings are of crucial importance in the plot of the trilogy because she takes action incited by them. Agamemnon's paternal feelings are also vital to the trilogy, exactly because he fails in them. Orestes' different feelings towards each of his parents drive his actions throughout the trilogy.

Moreover, a more seminal role, which is related to the expression of feelings (like pity, fear, agony), is also given to some of the characters that were traditionally part of the story, albeit with lesser roles. In the *Agamemnon*, for instance, Kasandra is given a role of both silence and divination and, possibly for the first time ever, she has her own moving moment foretelling her sad fate and that of her host-family. In the play she is the only non-Greek character and the only one who stands up to Klytaimnestra, through her refusal to answer her questions. She also becomes, early on in the trilogy, an example of offending the gods and a living proof of the pain that this entails. Kassandra is also used for the representation of the off-stage killing virtually while it is taking place, [13] thus subdividing the 'messenger' role in an innovative way.[14]

---

[12] See p. 296, for the *Iphigeneia* of Aischylos as another possible source for the *Oresteia*.

[13] Taplin (1977: 84).

[14] See pp. 32-33, on the opportunities and limitations of the theatre that shape the way in which the story is told.

The role of the nurse is another interesting use of a minor character in the *Oresteia*. Kilissa's crucial intervention in the *Choephoroi*, after a moving speech, saves Orestes' life (cf. ll. 764-82), when she bids Aigisthos to come without armed attendants.[15] In early tradition there was already a nurse with feelings for Orestes: in Pindar (*P.* 11.16) she saved Orestes as a child by sending him to safety, in Pherekydes (*FGH* 3 fr. 134) she saved Orestes but lost her own son, whom Aigisthos killed mistaking him for Orestes. In Aischylos, the nurse is used both to undermine Klytaimnestra's position as mother (it is the nurse who reared Orestes and who has maternal feelings for him) and this makes the killing more palatable, and to subvert the queen's plans.

The new role of the watchman (cf. *Od.* 4.524-9) and the opening of the *Agamemnon* with this man on the roof of the palace was a stroke of originality and surprise (cf. *A.* 1-39). In the *Odyssey* the watchman was stationed there by Aigisthos to report to him and his motive was evidently money (cf. *Od.* 4.525-6). In the *Oresteia*, on the other hand, the watchman was stationed at his post by Klytaimnestra and he is explicitly a loyal servant of Agamemnon. Aischylos is thus able to enhance the gender inversion in the play. Moreover, the watchman is given by Aischylos a more complex role; his speech begins the development of the atmosphere of partially articulated fear which dominates the *Agamemnon*. (Since the watchman is not part of the plot, he can only intuit danger, not specify it).

[15] Garvie (1986: 24 intro.); March (2001: 4, n. 14).

Another significant innovation of the poet is the way in which he chooses to resolve together the issues of Orestes' matricide, the problems with the nature of justice in the trilogy and the themes of conflict between sexes and generations. Aischylos employs a solution that draws heavily on contemporary Athenian political experience: he inserts in the story the Areopagos.[16] This new factor both allows the play to reflect current political developments and invites the Athenians to relate to the story better through their own very recent experiences. The reform of the Areopagos only took place in 462-1 B.C.,[17] and its use in the *Oresteia* proves Aischylos' alertness to the dramatic potential of contemporary developments. The trial which he stages on this occasion, however, includes no set speeches, and, as a result, in this aspect it does not resemble real-life trials closely (cf. pp. 254-5). There are many more allusions to fifth-century reality in the three plays that have been noted by researchers.[18] The location of the palace,[19] for example, can also be seen through the prism of contemporary politics: the Argive alliance of Athens is suggested to be one of the reasons for the insertion of Argos in the story.[20] This innovation might, in fact, be the combined effect of dramatic and political reasons.[21]

---

[16] For discussions on the use of the Areopagos in the play, see: Dodds (1960: 22-3); Samons (1999: 221-33); Schaps (1993: 505-15); MacLeod (1982: 127-33); Podlecki (1989: 4); Dover (1987: 161-75); Carey (2007: 11; 22).

[17] Podlecki (1989: 17-21) discusses the reform of the Areopagos extensively.

[18] See Bowie (1993: 10-31), and discussion in pp. 306-7.

[19] Aischylos moved the palace of Agamemnon to Argos, unlike Homer (*Od.* 3.305), Stesichoros, Simonides and Pindar (*PMG* 216 / schol. E. *Or.* 46; Pi. *P.* 11.15).

[20] MacLeod (1982: 126-7); Schaps (1993: 514).

[21] MacLeod (1982: 126-7) suggests that in dramatic terms the change makes Agamemnon and Menalaos rule together, the one is not subordinate to the other and both are equally obliged to punish Paris' behaviour.

The *Oresteia* is told by Aischylos in a way that adds further dramatic tension to an already dark story and, at the same time, offers the Athenians a linkage to the mythical characters, their actions, their motivation and their problems by presenting on stage elements of contemporary Athenian reality. This way the story becomes to some extent modern in Athens of the fifth century and, simultaneously, present-day issues can be re-examined by the poet and his audience with the freedom that the mythical façade might allow.

Reception of the Oresteia

The reception of the *Oresteia* by Sophokles and Euripides has been already discussed extensively by modern researchers.[22] This section is only meant to bring up, in brief, elements found in these discussions. The general outline of the plot of Sophokles' *Elektra* is not that different from the Aischylean *Choephoroi*. The scene is set outside the palace of Agamemnon, Klytaimnestra has a warning dream and then sends offerings to the tomb of Agamemnon, the news of Orestes' death arrive, and Elektra lives in the palace. On the contrary, unlike what happens in Aischylos, in Sophokles the motive of Klytaimnestra is never related to Iphigeneia's death, she and Aigisthos are joint partners in the crime, Klytaimnestra is killed first – so that the matricide is not the climax of the revenge - and Sophokles does not replicate Aischylos' intense concern for the moral issues raised by the matricide.[23]

[22] See especially March (1987: 81-118) and (2001: 1-11); Garvie (1986: 9-26 intro.).

[23] March (1987: 104; 115).

The date of the play by Sophokles is unclear, as is the date of the homonymous play of Euripides. It is widely believed, however, that Sophokles probably wrote his play after Euripides wrote his *Elektra*; Sophokles' *Elektra* is considered to be one of the late plays of the poet,[24] whereas Euripides' *Elektra* is usually dated on stylistic details to 422-16 B.C.[25]

Euripides' *Elektra* is a play similar in certain aspects to the *Choephoroi* of Aischylos: there is the recognition of Elektra and Orestes that leads to the preparation of their revenge, the murder of Klytaimnestra is the climax of the play, and the Furies pursue Orestes raising the moral question of the matricide. There are, however, important differences: for example, Euripides makes Elektra the wife of a farmer and moves her away from the palace to a cottage in the countryside. This both reshapes the social setting of the play (while also expanding the thematic range and enhancing the proximity of characters to the audience in a complex and disturbing way), and allows place for the creation of Autourgos, a decent person who is not involved in all the terrible things that take place. This removal of Elektra from the palace opens up possibilities for new elements in the action and makes the arrival of Orestes at her cottage more practical and more realistic. Furthermore, the dramatic confrontation between Orestes and his mother before her murder is avoided in Euripides. It is Elektra who has the dominant role in the play. Klytaimnestra is sympathetic to some extent

[24] March (2001: 22) dates the play to 413-10; Kamerbeek (1974: 6) dates the play between 425-409, closer to the latter.

[25] The older suggestion for 413 B.C by Denniston (1939: 33 intro.) is no longer considered probable. Kamerbeek (1974: 6); March (2001: 6) suggest 422-16 B.C.

because she is allowed maternal feelings both for Orestes and for Elektra. The trial of Orestes is included in another play, the *Orestes*, and there it is treated differently than in the *Eumenides*, though with clear allusions to it.[26]

Finally, Euripides' reception of the Aischylean trilogy is marked by certain intertextual references. The recognition scene is the clearest surviving example of intertextuality with the work of Aischylos, forming an indirect criticism of the unrealistic means that the older poet on occasion employed. It is, moreover, consistent with Euripides' pursuit of realism (cf. pp. 232-35).

Few things can be retrieved from the Roman plays on the story. In Roman theatre there are several plays written on the story of the *Oresteia*,[27] but the only one for which some conclusions can be drawn is Ennius' *Eumenides* (frs 63-6 Jocelyn).[28] The murder of Klytaimnestra takes place in Ennius' *Eumenides* under compulsion and Orestes is acquitted by Athena in a court (cf. fr. 64 Jocelyn).

Iconography

In the case of the *Oresteia*, iconography has proven capable of misleading us: the case of the Boston *Oresteia* crater is telling. The vase was used as evidence for the impact of Aischylos' trilogy on art when it actually predated 458 B.C.[29] On the contrary, when

[26] See p. 235, n. 51.

[27] See the discussion in Podlecki (1989: 23-6);

[28] Jocelyn (1967: 283-9).

[29] See p. 25.

the vase is put to good use, it can verify for us some of the elements pre-existing in myth before Aischylos.

There has been a lot of discussion regarding the influence of the trilogy on iconography over the centuries. Prag discusses the possibibility of the indirect influence of the trilogy on iconography during the second half of the fifth century.[30] Revivals of the play in south-Italy and the impact of the trilogy on iconography have also been extensively discussed.[31] The story appears to have been among the favoured ones in south-Italy.[32]

Conclusion

The innnovation of Aischylos in the treatment of the *Oresteia* myth was both extensive and critically important for future representations. The tragedian magnified the conflict between Klytaimnestra and Agamemnon by making her stronger, and therefore a more than apt opponent of the king. He pushed Aigisthos aside and brought forth a neglected motivation of Klytaimnestra that added to the tension of the story: the death of her daughter. This made her the victim of Agamemnon, explained her anger and revenge more adequately than adultery or the thirst for power ever could and, as a result, complicated things considerably. Moreover, Aischylos presented the question of the matricide as unsolvable by traditional epic or human means and eventually employed an Athenian institution, along with divine intervention, to attempt a solution.

[30] Prag (1985: 105).

[31] See Podlecki (1989: 27-30), for representations of the *Eumenides* in south-Italy. See Kossatz-Deissmann (1978; 89-117), for a detailed description of south-Italian vases related to performances of the three plays.

[32] Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 116).

Aischylos' version, both more intense than ever attested before as well as contemporary, won him the first victory of the 458 B.C. dramatic contest (*Agamemnon argumentum MGFV /TrGF* iii *testimonium* Gh65a.2-3). The trilogy had a huge impact on the reception of the story thereafter and the perception of the main characters.

The Aias tragedies

The epic story of Aias

The story of the end of Aias was found in the epic cycle and was probably most fully developed in the *Little Iliad.* In the summary of Proklos the story is found at the very beginning (*PEG argumentum* 1. 3-5). Following the award of the weapons Aias endures a fit of madness, kills the booty and then commits suicide.

> ἡ τῶν ὅπλων κρίσις γίνεται καὶ Ὀδυσσεὺς κατὰ βούλησιν Ἀθηνᾶς λαμβάνει, Αἴας δ' ἐμμανὴς γενόμενος τήν τε λείαν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν λυμαίνεται καὶ ἑαυτὸν ἀναιρεῖ.

From the *Little Iliad* (*PEG* fr. 3.2-5) we further learn that Aias was not cremated, as was the usual epic practice, but inhumed because the king was angry with him:

> ὁ τὴν μικρὰν Ἰλιάδα γράψας ἱστορεῖ μηδὲ καυθῆναι συνήθως τὸν Αἴαντα, τεθῆναι δὲ οὕτως ἐν σορῷ διὰ τὴν ὀργὴν τοῦ βασιλέως.

The inhumation of Aias' corpse instead of cremation is also found in Apollodoros *Epit.* 5.7. The summary of Proklos for the *Aithiopis* ends after the death of Achilleus, when the dispute for his weapons occurs (*PEG argumentum* 22-4):

> οἱ δὲ Ἀχαιοὶ τὸν τάφον χώσαντες ἀγῶνα τιθέασι, καὶ περὶ τῶν Ἀχιλλέως ὅπλων Ὀδυσσεῖ καὶ Αἴαντι στάσις ἐμπίπτει.

A *testimonium* notes that Aias was killed at dawn (schol. Pi. *I.* 58b; *PEG testimonium* 5.3-4): ὁ γὰρ τὴν Αἰθιοπίδα γράφων περὶ τὸν ὄρθρον φησὶ τὸν Αἴαντα ἑαυτὸν ἀνελεῖν. It is not improbable that a detail such as this suggests a circumstantial account and not just a passing mention of the suicide of the hero, suggesting that the judgment of

weapons and the suicide were presented in the *Aethiopis* as well.[1] In the *Iliou Persis* there is another testimony mentioning the madness of Aias (*PEG* fr. 4.7-8). In the *Odyssey* (11.541-65), when the two heroes meet in the underworld, Aias shows his continuing resentment of Odysseus because of the weapons. However fragmentary the remains of epic poetry are, the following elements of the story can be discerned: the award of Achilleus' weapons, the victory of Odysseus, the madness of Aias, the killing of the booty, Aias' suicide and the denial of a proper burial. This does not presuppose that these elements remained unchanged in all epic poems or elsewhere in tradition.[2]

A probable trilogy?

There is a widespread assumption that three tragedies formed a trilogy on the conflict between Aias and Odysseus, the suicide of the former and the reaction of Telamon upon Teukros' return to Salamis. The three tragedies are the *Hoplon Krisis*, the *Threissai* and the *Salaminiai*.[3] Although there might be some thematic and chronological links between the plays, we have no secure proof and there is no ancient source to attest to the existence of an Aischylean trilogy on Aias. It is therefore unwise to take the trilogy for granted. However, the plays are discussed together here in order to provide an overview of Aischylos' reception of the myth of Aias. This also allows us to note connections

[1] For the unclear boundaries between epic songs see introduction, p. 19.

[2] Pi. *N.* 7; 8; *I.* 4; 6 contain some more information that is noted later. We also know that the lyric poet Timotheos wrote an *Aias Emmanes* (*PMG* 777), nothing of which survives.

[3] As proposed by Mette (1963: 122); Ferrari (1982: 154); March (1991-3: 4); Sommerstein (1996: 57). Modern scholars, however, are not unanimous on the reconstruction of the hypothetical trilogy; West (2000: 338) finds this suggestion plausible, but allows the possibility that the *Philoktetes* could be the third play.

between the plays which might have been developed by Aischylos, if in fact they did form a trilogy, without presupposing the trilogy format.

The *Hoplon Krisis*

Fragments and testimonia

The story of the *Hoplon Krisis*, as is attested by Aristoteles (*Po.* 1459b5), is based on the narrative of the *Little Iliad*, a poem in which it has been suggested that Odysseus played a central role.[4] As is indicated by the title, the story of the play revolves around the judgment over Achilleus' weapons as between Odysseus and Aias. The fragments assigned to this tragedy by ancient writers are *TrGF* iii frs. 174-8 and, although none exceeds two lines, they allow us to form an idea of the key events of the play. *TrGF* iii fr. 174, for example, is preserved in an interesting scholion on Aristophanes (schol. *Ach.* 883). The scholiast notes the following:

> ὁ στίχος ἀπὸ δράματος Αἰσχύλου Ὅπλων κρίσεως, οὕτως ἐπιγεγραμμένου, ἐν ᾧ ἐπικαλεῖται τὰς Νηρεΐδας ἐξελθούσας κρῖναι πρὸς τὴν Θέτιν τις λέγων·

There follows *TrGF* iii fr. 174

> δέσποινα πεντήκοντα Νηρήδων κορᾶν

The scholion poses two questions. The first question is raised by the verb κρῖναι. The Nereids and Thetis, according to the scholiast, are called to judge. This brings to mind the contest for the weapons. There is, of course, the problem that not once is Thetis

[4] Holt (1992: 327-8) suggested that the story in the *Little Iliad* was necessarily told in a way that would diminish the importance of Aias with a judgment that would verify the value of Odysseus against a traditionally great hero. For a general overview of Odysseus' presence in the epic cycle and the growing hostility against him in later years, that is also evident on fifth-century B.C. stage, see Stanford (1954: 80-117).

attested in literature or iconography as being the judge of the contest. There is no obvious reason, however, to disregard the scholia. If the Nereids and Thetis do not take the decision regarding the winner of the contest, then what do they judge? In order to get a better understanding of the way in which Aischylos treated this incident, one must first discuss the way in which the judgment issue was solved in other sources.

There is a consistent combination of divine and human will in the judgment in all versions of the story. In the *Odyssey*, when Aias refuses to speak to Odysseus in the underworld, the latter explains that the reason for this was the judgment about Achilleus' weapons, the judges being Trojan παῖδες and Athena (11.547). The judgment was also presented in the *Little Iliad*, and Proklos notes in his summary (*PEG argumentum* 3-4) that it is Athena who makes the choice. More details are given by a surviving fragment of the poem (*PEG Little Iliad* fr. 2) presenting two Trojan girls discussing who was the strongest - Aias or Odysseus. The first thinks it is Aias because he carried the dead Achilleus off the battlefield. The other believes that this even a woman could do, whereas Odysseus was the real hero for having fought to keep the Trojans off Aias who was carrying the body of Achilleus.

> Αἴας μὲν γὰρ ἄειρε καὶ ἔκφερε δηϊοτῆτος
> ἥρω Πηλεΐδην, οὐδ' ἤθελε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς.
>
> *
>
> πῶς ἐπεφωνήσω; πῶς οὐ κατὰ κόσμον ἔειπες;
> <καί κε γυνὴ φέροι ἄχθος, ἐπεί κεν ἀνὴρ ἀναθείη,
> ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν μαχέσαιτο.>

There is another possibility for the identity of the judges in Aischylos, as is made evident from a series of early fifth century B.C. vases. The vases in question (*LIMC* Aias 81-86) depict the Achaeans voting with stones, the two heroes standing each next to a pile, the bigger being that of Odysseus, while Athena is occasionally presented standing between the two.[5] With the exception of the last being dated to the second quarter of the fifth century, the rest of the vases are dated to the first quarter of the century, and this certainly eliminates the possibility of any Sophoklean influence. The story as presented on these vases is somehow complete; portrayed on these vases are the contestants, the judges, the supervisor and the result of the judgment. Could this version have been inspired by a text circulating at the very beginning of the fifth century?

Pindar in *N.* 8.23-7 presents the Greeks judging by secret ballot[6] the award of the arms of Achilleus to Odysseus, following a verbal contest between the two heroes.

> κεῖνος καὶ Τελαμῶνος δάψεν υἱόν,
>
> φασγάνῳ ἀμφικυλίσαις.
>
> ἦ τιν' ἄγλωσσον μέν, ἦτορ δ' ἄλκιμον, λάθα κατέχει
>
> ἐν λυγρῷ νείκει· μέγιστον δ' αἰόλῳ ψεύ-
>
> δει γέρας ἀντέταται.
>
> κρυφίαισι γὰρ ἐν ψάφοις Ὀδυσσῆ Δαναοὶ θεράπευσαν·

[5] All the vases are Attic red-figure cups. *LIMC* 81-2 are the work of Douris (cf. respectively Beazley, 1963: 429, 26; 433, 71-2), *LIMC* 83 (cf. Beazley, 1971: 367, 1) and 84 (cf. Beazley, 1963: 369, 2) are the work of the Brygos painter. *LIMC* 85 is the work of Makron (cf. Beazley, 1963: 459, 11) and *LIMC* 86 is the work of the painter of Louvre G 265 (cf. Beazley, 1963: 416, 7).

[6] Garvie (1998: 4-5) suggests that the reference to κρυφίαισι ψάφοις should not be taken to mean a secret ballot but that some kind of cheating was involved in voting.

χρυσέων δ' Αἴας στερηθεὶς ὅπλων φόνῳ πάλαισεν.

The relationship between this text and Aischylos is complicated by uncertainty about its date. Pindar's *N.* 8 has often been considered to be of an early date, perhaps as early as 491 B.C.[7] However, several scholars recently incline to a later date.[8] There is also a brief reference to the judgment in Pi. *N.* 7.23-27 (485? B.C.).[9] A gnomic statement that the great majority of men have a blind heart is followed by a specific application to the myth of Aias; the poet asserts that if this majority could see the truth, Aias would not have committed suicide. This implies that the decision was taken by mortals and en masse.

τυφλὸν δ' ἔχει
ἦτορ ὅμιλος ἀνδρῶν ὁ πλεῖστος. εἰ γὰρ ἦν
ἓ τὰν ἀλάθειαν ἰδέμεν, οὔ κεν ὅπλων χολωθείς
ὁ καρτερὸς Αἴας ἔπαξε διὰ φρενῶν
λευρὸν ξίφος·

Moreover, a fragment of tragedy (P. Oxy. 2256 fr. 71), tentatively assigned to Aischylos (*TrGF* iii **fr. 451q), has the Achaeans judging (ll. 9-17).[10] The subject of this choral

[7] For various suggestions, see Farnell (1961: 303), who sides, however, with the later dating.

[8] Bowra (1964: 412); Snell and Maehler (1987: 126) suggest 459 B.C. with reservations.

[9] Date as suggested by Snell and Maehler (1987: 121).

[10] For the assignment, see Lobel (1952: 57). Apparently, the tragedy was considered by Lobel to include the death of the hero.

fragment, which is 18 lines long, is the death of Aias as a result of the judgment for Achilleus' weapons.

<ΧΟ.>

] .[. .] .[

τάξομα[ι

τίς τάδ' [ ] .[

πήματ[.] .[.]δεχοιτ[

αντ.[. .]ιμ. . .[

τὸν δὴ περιρρυ[τ]. .[

ὤλ[εσ]αν ῥυσίπτολ[ιν

π[οι]μανδρίδαι [

ὄρχαμ[οί] τ' ἐπίσκο[ποι

τευχ[έ]ων [.]πε[λ]πίσαντ[10

δίκᾳ δ' Ὀδυσσῆϊ ξυνῇσαν [

ο]ὐκ ἰσο[ρ]ρ[όπ]ῳ φρενί'

] σφιν εὐθύν[. . .]. .[

μελ]αγχίτων[

.[. .]. .αις ξιφοκτον[

ὥσπερ καὶ Τελαμω[ν

αὐ]τοκτόνος ὤλετο [

]. . . .πρ[

. . .

It was pointed out by Snell that l. 16 starts with the phrase ὥσπερ καὶ Τελαμω[ν, when speaking of Aias' suicide.[11] This implies that in this text Aias and his suicide was introduced for the sake of comparison, not as the main subject of the song; accordingly, Lloyd-Jones has suggested that it should be assigned to the *Philoktetes* of Aischylos.[12] Nevertheless, even if the fragment could be assigned conclusively to Aischylos, if it did not belong to a play which had Aias as is main theme, it would be unwise to assume that Aischylos used the version with the votes in the *Hoplon Krisis* simply because he used it on another occasion.

TrGF iii **fr. 451q and the odes of Pindar cannot be securely dated and all references are brief enough to allow us to suggest that the audience was already familiar with a version involving the Achaeans judging. Apparently, as early as the beginning of the fifth century, Aischylos had a choice between using the Achaeans in the judgment (as the vases discussed do) or not (as the epic sources suggest), and he was even free to use different versions in his corpus, if appropriate.

March, on the basis of the vases, suggests that the Achaeans judged in the *Hoplon Krisis*, apparently rejecting the scholion.[13] It is not certain, in our view, that vases are so reliable

[11] Snell (1953: 439-40).

[12] Lloyd-Jones (1963: 584-6). This possibility, which is not improbable, is discussed in pp. 220-1.

[13] March (1991-3: 5-7).

when trying to reconstruct lost tragedies that one should reject an explicit *testimonium.*[14] The vases tell us no more than that the version of the Achaeans judging was known earlier than Sophokles' *Aias*. One could be inclined to suggest that Thetis, the Nereids and the Achaeans all judge together in Aischylos, in an effort to combine the information of the scholion with that of the vases. Though not inconceivable, this compromise position has no positive evidence to support it. On present evidence there is in fact no indication that the Achaeans judged in the *Hoplon Krisis*.

In contrast, the reliability of the scholion is enhanced by its specificity; it gives the name of the poet, the title of the play, asserts that the characters invoked in the fragment which Aristophanes cites are the Nereids and Thetis, and, finally, explains the reason for their presence in words that point to the title and, therefore, to the actual judgment. Are the Nereids, then, the chorus of the play and, therefore, called upon in the prologue, or are they called on later in the play by a chorus of Achaeans, for example? The poet could have presented a chorus of Achaeans, or Salaminians, to witness the judgment and to express the collective's view. In the latter case, the Nereids could only function as a second chorus.[15] Such a chorus would have a purpose to serve, the judgment, which could justify the presence of the Nereids on stage.

---

[14] The vases are Attic and do not acknowledge their theatricality (as south-Italian vases occasionally do), which might have been an additional indicator to connect them to a play. For the problems presented by the evidence of vase-painting, see pp. 22-7.

[15] See Carrière (1977: 73), who suggests that there is a supplementary chorus of Nereids in the *Hoplon Krisis*, the first being one of Greek soldiers. Taplin (1977: 236-7), attests six cases of secondary choruses in tragedy, in cases where they have a clearly defined function; for Taplin the *Hiketides* is not among these plays exactly because there is no function for a second chorus. See Garvie (1969: 193), for a discussion on the existence of a second chorus in the play and relevant bibliography.

To conclude, it is likely that Thetis is the judge in the contest for the weapons, together with the Nereids and this would appear to be an Aischylean innovation, perhaps inspired by the *Odyssey* (11.543-8; 24.85-92) where the mother is responsible for the funeral games in honour of her son. The funeral games and the judgment of weapons are often connected in literature and the judgment sometimes follows after the games. In Q.S. Thetis brings forth the weapons after the funeral games (5.1-3; 121-7) and Aias and Odysseus stand up to claim them.[16] The funeral games and the contest for the weapons are also connected in the summary of the *Aithiopis* (*PEG argumentum* 22-4) and in Roman tragedy by Pacuvius (cf. pp. 93-4). This connection could lie at the root of Aischylos' idea to use Thetis in a new role at the judgment, perhaps further advanced by the importance often given to divine will in narrations of the judgment.

Aischylos may have preferred Thetis as judge over the Trojans of the epic cycle or the Achaeans of the vases because it allowed him to focus the dispute between Odysseus and Aias and to exclude the sociopolitical dimension associated with the army, thus making it more personal.[17] The collective, as a result, would be free of responsibility and guilt. The Achaeans could only take part in the contest as spectators. The reluctance to present an Aias in dispute with the army may relate to the importance of Aias as a cult hero in

[16] In Q.S. Aias suggests that Idomeneus, Nestor and Agamemnon should judge but they refuse, because they are afraid of what is to follow and therefore, suggest that the Trojan prisoners should judge (5.138-77).

[17] If the rejection of Aias by the collective was indeed avoided, then Aischylos' transformation of other stories into collisions between a hero and the collective, even when this is never before attested, as is the case of Achilleus and the army in the *Myrmidones* (cf. pp. 117-20), would be surprisingly different. This could serve variation needs in his corpus or the ambition of the poet to compete with the previous versions.

Athens of the fifth century; this is discussed below in relation to the possibility that Aischylos made an effort to restore the hero who was left dishonoured in epic (cf. p. 45).

As a result of Aischylos' innovation, the outcome depends on the two heroes' capacity to persuade the goddess.[18] This takes us to the next surviving fragment. *TrGF* iii fr. 175:

> ἀλλ' Ἀντικλείας ἄσσον ἦλθε Σίσυφος,
>
> τῆς σῆς λέγω τοι μητρός, ἥ σ' ἐγείνατο

The fragment addressed to Odysseus, as well as the note following it (schol. S. *Aj.* 190d: φαίνεται δὲ τὸ κακόηθες αὐτοῦ καὶ διὰ τῆς γενέσεως) is important because it demonstrates how Aias, in all probability, sensed some kind of deceit on the part of Odysseus and accused him of being the offspring of Sisyphos, with all the implications which that entailed. *TrGF* iii fr. 176: ἁπλᾶ γάρ ἐστι τῆς ἀληθείας ἔπη appears to contrast an eloquent Odysseus with a truthful Aias; the words may well be spoken by Aias himself. This would suggest that both heroes gave a speech to persuade the judges of their value and that Aias was uanble to compete with the eloquent and misleading speech of Odysseus. If Odysseus was cunning, then his Sisyphean origin is not mentioned without reason, and he would, thus, be closer to his harsh profile as found in the cycle. The Odysseus of Sophokles' *Aias*, on the other hand, with his magnanimity against a fallen enemy seems to be closer to the Odyssean profile of the hero. This would probably imply a very different presentation of Odysseus in two plays on the same saga.

[18] Thetis as judge raises a problem which is, at least, worth noting. Odysseus is able to persuade, if not necessarily deceive, divine, not merely human, judges.

This was not be the first time, however, that a verbal contest of some kind takes place between the two heroes, each retaining his cyclic characteristics, and each carrying his responsibility for the result of the judgment. Pindar and the fragment of Aischylos mentioned above allow some contest of words between the two heroes.[19] In the *Hoplon Krisis* the contest between Aias and Odysseus, which was the axis around which the play revolved, would be presented on stage (Aias addresses Odysseus in *TrGF* iii fr. 175).[20] The contest of words, for example, could be on the topic of the removal of Achilleus' corpse from the battlefield, as is the case in *PEG Little Iliad* fr. 2, and as it is possibly indicated by Pindar *N.* 8.28-34 and Q.S. 5.180-5; 285-90. In this context, the invulnerability of Aias, found in the *Threissai*, whether as a link between the plays -if they belong to the same trilogy- or simply as independent repetition of the invulnerability motif (cf. pp. 65-6), could have been used by Odysseus to diminish the importance of Aias' contribution. Aias, on the other hand, could have attacked Odysseus for his pretended madness and for his initial reluctance to join the expedition, as this accusation is repeatedly found in Q.S. 5.191-5, and in the Roman plays on the judgment (cf. pp. 93-6). The formal *agon* is something that we do not find in the surviving plays of Aischylos,[21] but it is very likely that some form of *agon* was possibly to be found in this

[19] A contest of words of some form, however, is perhaps implied in *Odyssey* 11.543-8 where the judgment is mentioned; Odyssseus says that he received the weapons *dikazomenos*.

[20] March (1991-3: 5) also suggests that the two men contended verbally.

[21] Lloyd (1992: 2) notes that Aischylos appears to avoid structured debate even where the context appears to invite it. The use of the *agon* in the case of Aias might be an important way in which the fragmentary plays expand our knowledge of Aischylos.

tragedy, as well as in the lost *Palamedes* of Aischylos.[22] In this respect the surviving corpus may not be entirely representative of Aischylos' range.

TrGF iii fr. 177 could imply the disappointment of Aias following the weapons being given to Odysseus: τί γὰρ καλὸν ζῆν †βίοντ' ὃς λύπας φέρει; This could introduce the thought of suicide as a means of escaping dishonour. *TrGF* iii fr. 177a is not very helpful: καὶ διὰ πλευμόνων θερμὸν ἄησιν ὕπνον and *TrGF* iii fr. 178 is of lexicographical interest.

The case of TrGF iii fr. 350

This would seem to be an opportune moment to discuss an additional fragment, occasionally assigned to this play. This is *TrGF* iii fr. 350, a quotation of Aischylos in Platon (*R.* 383 A 7). Platon, without naming the tragedy from which the fragment comes, examines the attitude of the poets towards the gods and reproaches Aischylos for having Thetis speak of Apollon in the way she does.

> πολλὰ ἄρα Ὁμήρου ἐπαινοῦντες ἀλλὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπαινεσόμεθα, τὴν τοῦ ἐνυπνίου πομπὴν ὑπὸ Διὸς τῷ Ἀγαμέμνονι· οὐδὲ Αἰσχύλου, ὅταν φῇ ἡ Θέτις τὸν Ἀπόλλω ἐν τοῖς αὑτῆς γάμοις ᾄδοντα (*TrGF* iii fr. 350) ὅταν τις τοιαῦτα λέγῃ περὶ θεῶν, χαλεπαινοῦμέν τε καὶ χορὸν οὐ δώσομεν, οὐδὲ τοὺς διδασκάλους ἐάσομεν ἐπὶ παιδείᾳ χρῆσθαι τῶν νέων.

[22] See pp. 254-6.

TrGF iii fr. 350

ΘΕΤΙΣ·
Apollo in nuptiis meis cecinit τὰς ἐμὰς εὐπαιδίας
νόσων τ' ἀπείρους καὶ μακραίωνας βίου,
ξύμπαντά τ' εἰπὼν θεοφιλεῖς ἐμὰς τύχας
παιῶν' ἐπηυφήμησεν εὐθυμῶν ἐμέ.
κἀγὼ τὸ Φοίβου θεῖον ἀψευδὲς στόμα
ἤλπιζον εἶναι, μαντικῇ βρύον τέχνῃ·
ὁ δ' αὐτὸς ὑμνῶν, αὐτὸς ἐν θοίνῃ παρών,
αὐτὸς τάδ' εἰπών, αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ κτανὼν
τὸν παῖδα τὸν ἐμόν

Different suggestions have been made for the identification of the tragedy from which this fragment comes.[23] M.L. West attributes *TrGF* iii fr. 350 to the tragedy *Nereides*, but to do this he has to reject the sequence usually given to the three plays of Aischylos on Achilleus, this being (a) *Myrmidones*, (b) *Nereides*, (c) *Phryges* or *Hektoros Lytra*,[24] and suggests the following order: *Myrmidones*, *Phryges* or *Hektoros Lytra* and *Nereides*.[25] The last, he suggests, treats the death of Achilleus and not of Patroklos, as in the traditional sequence given to this trilogy, with the Nereids present to mourn for Achilleus. There is not enough evidence for the *Nereides* to reject this view, but there are, however, certain problematic implications for the *Myrmidones* if the *Nereides* does not come prior to the ransoming of Hektor. The *Myrmidones* would have to include an extensive series of events: the embassy to Achilleus (cf. *Il.* 9.182-668), the appeals of

[23] According to Radt (1985: 417), who includes the fragment in the *incertarun fabularum* section of his edition, the controversy started early in the nineteenth century when different suggestions were made.

[24] See p. 97.

[25] West (2000: 340-3).

Patroklos to be allowed to join the battle, Achilleus' permission to do so, the news for Patroklos' death, the mourning, the arrival of Thetis with the new weapons, some kind of resolution of the *menis* between Achilleus and Agamemnon, the return of Achilleus to the battlefield and, finally, the news for the death of Hektor. Only then could the story proceed with the ransoming, as found in the *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra.* This is an implausible density of incident for an Aeschylean tragedy; it looks more like late Sophokles or Euripides. This makes the assignment of fr. 350 to the *Nereides* improbable.

Gantz, on the other hand, suggests that *TrGF* iii fr. 350 belongs to the *Phrygioi* where Thetis would be lamenting Achilleus' death, and considers the play to be the third in a trilogy with *Memnon* and *Psychostasia.*[26] Thus, in the *Phrygioi*, Thetis would have to come on stage to mourn for her child immediately after his death. The accusations of this passage and its rhetoric would perhaps be less appropriate than the mourning and would work better if they were chronologically detached from the actual death. Besides, there is nothing to attest the existence of this tragedy other than a disputed title.

An old suggestion, which the current study adopts, is that *TrGF* iii fr. 350 comes from the early part of the *Hoplon Krisis.*[27] It seems plausible that Thetis would briefly speak of

[26] Gantz (1981: 21-2). For all the controversy both on the existence of a *Phrygioi* and on the third play of such a trilogy, see p. 185.

[27] See Radt (1985: 417), where the early assignments to the *Hoplon Krisis* (e.g. Lachmann, *De Mensura Tragoediarum*, 1822; Schneider, *Platonis Opera*, 1830) are noted.

her loss, when called to give away her son's weapons (cf. *TrGF* iii fr. 174). It is possible, therefore, that *TrGF* iii fr. 350 is part of Thetis' speech when she comes to set the prize of the contest and decide the winner. The fragment would, thus, be placed at the beginning of the *Hoplon Krisis* and would be a side story in the story of Aias. Thetis would speak of her son and of the betrayal of Apollon that cost her so much before taking the decision that she and the Nereids are called on to take. Moreover, Thetis' portrait in *TrGF* iii fr. 350, could be better understood in combination with indications that the *Kypria* presented her as a strong goddess that rejected the love of Zeus and was feared by him for the son he would give birth to.[28]

If one takes a closer look at the fragment, it is evident that, although Apollon as the killer of Achilleus is not a new theme,[29] Apollon prophesying longevity for Achilleus at the wedding of Thetis and Peleus is something surprising. Usually the prophecies for Achilleus related to the wedding scene of his parents focus on his future accomplishments at Troy, without lying about a supposed longevity (cf. Pi. *N.* 4.66-8; 5.23ff.; *P.* 3.88-92; E. *IA* 1061ff.), and without mentioning his death at Troy,[30] with the exception of Catullus 64.362-70. The distinctive difference of the prophecy of Apollon, as found in *TrGF* iii fr. 350, is the duplicity of the god, who, although he was to kill

[28] See Slatkin (1986: 1-24).

[29] Cf. Hektor's last words to Achilleus *Il.* 22.359-60, Xanthos' in 19.408-14 and *PEG Aithiopis argumentum* 15-6.

[30] For the rejection of the view that the prophecy for Achilleus in the Hesiodic *Gynaikon Katalogos* fr. 212b (MW) was a death prophecy but, instead, one that focused on the death of a Trojan hero at the hands of Achilleus, see Hadjicosti (2005: 547-54).

Achilleus in his youth, had foretold his supposed longevity. There are indications of problematic references to Apollon at the occasion of the wedding of Thetis in other cases (cf. *Il.* 24.55-64; Q.S. 3.96-127; Catullus 64.299-303)[31] but Apollon's false prophecy at the wedding party concerning the long life of the hero, who was mostly known as the one destined to die young,[32] appears to be an Aischylean innovation.

In the rest of the surviving corpus of Aischylos we come across the name of Apollon numerous times. In the *Oresteia* no other god is mentioned as often as he, and this is always done with respect. His prophecies are never doubted (*Ch.* 558-9; 269) and it is often noted that the real force behind his prophecies is the will of Zeus.[33] Orestes says that Apollon is not familiar with doing injustice (*Ch.* 85-7), and although the logic of Apollon is suspect in the trial in the *Eumenides*, his role is part of the plan of Zeus.

To conclude, with or without *TrGF* iii fr. 350, the *Hoplon Krisis* would present the contest for the weapons, a form of an *agon* between the two heroes, and the decision for the winner would be taken by Thetis and her sisters, perhaps for the first time ever. The result of the judgment would leave Aias in despair and anger. The inclusion of the fragment could hint at a reversal of Fate in the lives of illustrious heroes who were

[31] For further discussion, see Hadjicosti (2006c: 15-22).

[32] Achilleus is referred to as ὠκύμωρος in *Il.* 1.417, 505; 18.95, 458. Moreover, Thetis and Achilleus know in the *Iliad*, of the latter's forthcoming death: cf. *Il.* 1.352-4, 413-8; 9.410-6; 18.54-60, 88-90, 330-4, 440-1; 22.359; 23. 80-1, 243-8; 24.131-2.

[33] A. *Eu.* 19ff., 614-8 and S. *OC* 623, 791-3.

supposed to have long lives or be invulnerable but somehow they unexpectedly met their death.

The *Threissai*

The suicide efforts

The title is attested in the Catalogue. Not many fragments survive (*TrGF* iii frs. 83-5), a total of four lines in fact, but it is evident that the story revolved around the suicide of Aias. The most interesting of the fragments is *TrGF* iii fr. 83, preserved by the scholia on Sophokles' *Aias* 833, which describes how the sword of the hero was bending against his invulnerable body while he was attempting suicide, until a female daemon instructed him where to hit.

> <ΑΓΓ.> τὸ ξίφος ἐκάμπτετο οὐδαμῇ ἐνδιδόντος τοῦ χρωτὸς τῇ σφαγῇ,
>
> τόξον ὡς τις ἐντείνων
>
> πρὶν δή τις παροῦσα δαίμων ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ κατὰ ποῖον μέρος δεῖ χρήσασθαι τῇ σφαγῇ.

This would point to a protracted and ineffective effort of Aias to commit suicide. According to the same scholiast on *Aias* 833, who adds some additional information, in Aischylos the hero was almost wholly invulnerable because when he was a child Herakles had covered him in his lion skin:

> κατὰ τὸ ἄλλο σῶμα ἄτρωτος ἦν ὁ Αἴας, κατὰ δὲ τὴν μασχάλην μόνην τρωτὸς διὰ τὸ τὸν Ἡρακλέα τῇ λεοντῇ αὐτὸν σκεπάσαντα κατὰ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ἀσκέπαστον ἐᾶσαι διὰ τὸν γωρυτόν, ὃν περιέκειτο.

This indicates that in this instance Aischylos follows the cyclic tradition of invulnerable heroes over the Iliadic insistence on ineluctable mortality.[34] Only one spot, the armpit, was not covered by the lion-skin and that was Aias' sole vulnerable spot. On the same occasion, the scholiast additionally juxtaposes the effective one-blow suicide in Sophokles with what happens in other cases. The scholia on line 833 of Sophokles' *Aias* explain the swift and successful blow.

> ἀσκαρίστῳ καὶ σπασμὸν μὴ ἔχοντι, ἀντὶ συντόμως, ὥστε καιρίας τῆς πληγῆς γενομένης μὴ προσγενέσθαι σπασμὸν μηδὲ πολλὴν ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ διατριβήν. καὶ παρ' Εὐριπίδῃ· (*TrGF* v fr. 1020)
>
> ὁ δ' ἐσφάδαζεν οὐκ ἔχων ἀπαλλαγάς.
>
> σφαδάζειν δὲ ἔλεγον τὸ σπᾶσθαι καὶ σφακελίζειν.

Though in Sophokles Aias dies quickly, the scholia imply that this was not always the case. It is in this context that they mention Aischylos' suicide of Aias. The scholiast adds an example from Euripides, as well, but this need not necessarily be taken to imply the suicide of Aias by Euripides. The suicide of Aias is mentioned only once in surviving Euripides in *Helene* 96, where the death appears to be instant. There is no evidence for the existence of a play of Euripides with the suicide of Aias as its main theme. The fragment cited by the scholiast, edited in the *incertarum fabularum* section of *TrGF* v, could point to a painful and long death of another hero (e.g. Hippolytos).

In another scholion on *Aias* 815a it is noted that in Aischylos the death was narrated by a messenger and, therefore, not presented on stage as in Sophokles: φθάνει Αἰσχύλος ἐν

[34] Griffin (1977: 40); Hainsworth (1993: 282) note that invulnerability is un-Homeric.

Θρῄσσαις τὴν ἀναίρεσιν Αἴαντος δι' ἀγγέλου ἀπαγγείλας. This means that fr. 83 should be placed in a messenger speech. The audience was not to see the repeated efforts of Aias, but only to hear of them. The rest of the surviving fragments are not very helpful. *TrGF* iii fr. 84 reads: τὸ συγκλινές τ' ἐπ' Αἴαντι and could refer to the sword. *TrGF* iii fr. 84a reads: τρόποι δ' ἀμεμφεῖς, φιλόμουσοι, φιλοσυμπόται. *TrGF* iii fragment 85 is of lexicographical interest.

The invulnerability

The invulnerability of Aias is worth closer inspection. There is no doubt that in the *Iliad* Aias is vulnerable as other heroes are. This can be further deduced from the scholia on the text that repeatedly note that it was post-Homeric tradition that made Aias invulnerable and name Aischylos twice as the inventor of the invulnerability.[35] (However, even if we do accept that this appears for the first time in post-Homeric epic, this does not necessarily mean that one needs to accept the post-Homeric origin of the story.[36]) It should be noted that in the *Megalai Ehoiai* (fr. 250 MW), Herakles wished for a courageous and strong son of Telamon and covered him in his lion-skin, and in Pindar, *I.* 6.43-56 (dated c. 480 B.C.),[37] Herakles wished for a strong son for Telamon, as impenetrable as his own lion-skin (l. 47: τὸν μὲν ἄρρηκτον φυάν, ὥσ- / περ τόδε

[35] See scholia on the *Iliad*: Eust. 23.822 (καθ' Ὅμηρον οὐ τὴν πλευρὰν μόνην τρωτὸς ἦν ὁ Αἴας, ὡς οἱ μεθ' Ὅμηρον εἶπον); TV 14. 404 (τρωτὸς δὲ ὁ Αἴας ὅλον τὸ σῶμα, οὐχ, ὡς Αἰσχύλος, τὰ περὶ τὴν μασχάλην); Eust. 14.404 (τρωτὸς ὅλον ἦν ὁ Αἴας τὸ σῶμα καὶ οὐ μόνα τὰ περὶ μασχάλην κατὰ Αἰσχύλον καὶ ἄλλους). There is occasionally an effort by the scholiasts to explain this new tradition as resulting from the fact that the hero was never wounded in the *Iliad*. This explanation is not necessarily convincing because Aias was not the only hero never wounded in the *Iliad*.

[36] Burgess (2001: 132) suggests that the epic cycle was largely based on pre-Homeric tradition.

[37] Snell and Maehler (1987: 151).

δέρμα με νῦν περιπλανᾶται / θηρός) and with a strong heart to match, and received a good omen in return.

The armpit tradition is also present on certain works of ceramic and sculpture. Whereas the large majority of depictions of Aias' suicide (*LIMC* Aias 103-41) present the hero about to fall on his sword or having just committed suicide with the sword entering his stomach, there are a few cases that represent Aias just before, or right after, he pierces himself with the sword in an awkward place, most probably the armpit. These cases can be of an early date, as are the statuettes *LIMC* Aias 132 (480-60 B.C.),[38] *LIMC* 133 (470-50 B.C.),[39] *LIMC* 140 (first quarter of fifth c.),[40] and the scarab *LIMC* 141 (beginning of fifth c.),[41] or they can be of a later date, as are two fourth-century scarabs (*LIMC* 134[42] and Davies pl. 9.4[43]) and *LIMC* 117.[44] The armpit tradition, whether first invented by Aischylos or not, took its own course and was repeated both in literature, as the scholia suggest, and in visual arts.

---

[38] Davies (1971: 154, pl. 48.2). Note that Davies suspects that Aias is here addressing Athena before committing suicide, but there is no evidence to agree with this.

[39] Davies (1971: 148-54, pll. 45.1-4).

[40] This is an Attic red-figure cup by the Brygos painter. Shefton (1973: 203-7, pl. 1) suggested that a scene on the inside tondo of the cup that was initially considered to represent the dead Agamemnon and Klytaimnestra standing next to the corpse- cf. Beazley (1971: 367, 1)- covering it with a cloak, actually represents Aias and Tekmessa (note the position of the sword). See, moreover, Davies (1973: 60-2, pl. 9.1)

[41] Davies (1973: 63, pl. 9.3); Shefton (1973: 205, pll. 2a-b).

[42] Davies (1973: 63, pl. 9.5).

[43] Davies (1973: 63).

[44] This is an Etruscan red-figure crater of the group Turmuca, now in the British Museum, London (cf. Beazley, 1947: 136, 2).

The function of the invulnerability

The potential significance of the invulnerability theme in the *Threissai*, and possibly in a connected trilogy, as well, should be examined. From *TrGF* iii fr. 83 it appears that Aias does not know what the only vulnerable spot in his body is and cannot find it even after long and arduous efforts. This raises several questions: why is the hero seemingly ignorant of such a crucial and personal element as this? Did he, and others, perhaps believe that he was totally invulnerable, and was he fighting against all the odds to kill himself? There is only ground for speculation here.

Aias' ignorance, however, would allow scope for a dramatically effective narration of his continuous effort to end his life. Furthermore, this lack of knowledge and the repeated attempts would emphasize his determination to die. The invulnerability could even work in another way: a divine gift, much admired by others, is turned into a curse that Aias cannot escape, and this might not only have deprived him of the honour of winning the weapons of Achilleus (if it was cleverly turned against him by Odysseus in an *agon* of some form) but entrapped him among the living in a dishonourable state.

There is however another dimension. We should also consider the possibility of the invulnerability of the hero being used to open the possibilities for divine intervention: perhaps a crucial act of *charis* that was to save the hero from his torment.[45] In the scholia preserving *TrGF* iii fr. 83, there is some form of divine intervention related to the death of the hero, which is otherwise unattested in tradition. This is worth closer examination.

[45] In S. *OC* 1751-3 the death of Oidipous is referred to as *charis*.

The case for divine intervention

Since, as was noted above, the suicide occurred off stage and was narrated to the audience in a messenger speech, the scholion evidently points either to an off-stage epiphany witnessed by the messenger, or an inference by the speaker, as he attempts to explain the solution of what appeared to be an unsolvable - at least for human abilities- problem. To choose between these options, we need to examine cases in tragedy where the will or action of an undefined god is seen behind a human action.

There are many occasions in tragedy where an undefined daemon or god is considered responsible for an act, either of *charis* or of destruction.[46] In all cases, there is an effort to add more gravity to the act by attributing it to divine will. In such cases there is no suggestion that the speaker witnessed an epiphany. In the *Persai*, for example, the references to an undefined god helping the Greeks in their victory are repeatedly put forward (cf. *Pers.* 164: οὐκ ἄνευ θεῶν τινος; 345: δαίμων τις κατέφθειρε στρατόν; 724: γνώμης δέ πού τις δαιμόνων ξυνήψατο; 725: μέγας τις ἦλθε δαίμων ὥστε μὴ φρονεῖν καλῶς). There is no reason to doubt that the repetitive reference to divine intervention in the *Persai* reflected the belief of the Athenians that they had the gods' help in the battle of Salamis (cf. p. 80). In the *Agamemnon*, references are made to an undefined god saving the ship of Agamemnon among so many other ships that never made it back home (l. 663: θεός τις, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, οἴακος θιγών) and there is a further reference related to Kassandra (ll. 1174-5: καί τίς σε κακοφρονῶν τίθησι

[46] According to Mikalson (1991: 22), the term daemon, in the singular or plural, may indicate, like *theos/oi,* the abstract and undifferentiated collective of the gods, but it may also, like *theos*, refer to a specific deity.

δαίμων). In none of the above cases is the speaker suggesting that he ever saw a divine creature actually intervening in mortal affairs. This is merely the only logical explanation that the speaker can give and, in addition, he brings forth, more or less clearly, the case of divine will.

In Sophokles there are more examples where an undefined god performs an act determining mortal things, without any epiphany being required (cf. *Aj.* 1057; *OC* 1505-6; *Ant.* 598; *Tr.* 119; *OT* 1258). The latter example is worth closer attention. In *OT* 1258-60 a daemon is supposed to have showed to Oidipous the corpse of his dead wife (δαιμόνων δείκνυσί τις). The verb used, the same as in *TrGF* iii fr. 83, could imply that the god was actually present, if not for line 1260, (ὡς ὑφ' ἡγητοῦ τινος), suggesting that there was no kind of epiphany in this case, either. In Euripides, the relevant examples all point to the lack of an epiphany but to the acknowledgment of the difficulty of a situation that can only be explained through divine intervention (*Or.* 341-2; *Hec.* 201), or simply divine will (cf. *Alc.* 298; *Andr.* 270; 903; *Ba.* 764; *Med.* 1172; *IT* 867). In the above mentioned cases, the speaker, not having witnessed an epiphany, cannot speculate any further than δαίμων τις or θεός τις and, perhaps, there is no reason to do so, either.

In a society which believes in immanent gods and operates from an assumption that events are 'overdetermined', it is natural to interpret the paradoxical and inexplicable in terms of divine intervention and especially - since human beings, unlike epic narrators,

cannot identify the god in question - intervention by an unknown and unknowable deity.[47] Mikalson notes that this uncertainty concerning the identity of a god is in the nature of polytheism in real life.[48] Mikalson gives, moreover, two examples of unidentifiable gods intervening in tragedy, as this is perceived by the characters: the example of the miraculous disappearance of Helene in *Orestes* 1493-8 (this is the action of Apollon, as is later revealed in lines 1633-4) and the example of *IT* 264-78, when two unknown young men (Orestes and Pylades) are considered to be unidentifiable gods by an ignorant peasant.

Oidipous and an off-stage unidentified epiphany in tragedy

Let us now turn to a different testimony of divine intervention. An off-stage epiphany, what would in other words be the description of a miracle, witnessed by at least one person, takes place in the case of the *OC*. Interestingly for our discussion, in the *OC* a messenger narrates on stage the off-stage divine intervention in the death of Oidipous. According to the messenger, when it was time for Oidipous to die, a thunderbolt was heard to summon the hero (ll. 1604-6):

> ἐπεὶ δὲ πᾶσαν ἔσχε δρῶντος ἡδονὴν
> κοὐκ ἦν ἔτ' ἀργὸν οὐδὲν ὧν ἐφίετο,
> κτύπησε μὲν Ζεὺς χθόνιος

[47] For the usual areas of divine intervention (e.g. warfare, trade, safe voyages, agriculture), see Mikalson (1983: 18-26); Parker (2005: 387-451). Note that only in Aischylos is a wish for death directed to an Olympian god in *Pers.* 915-7, as noted by Mikalson (1991: 26). Usually such prayers are directed to non-Olympian gods (e.g. Thanatos, Hades).

[48] See Mikalson (1991: 21-2).

Then, an unidentified voice (φθέγμα τινὸς) calling Oidipous was heard but the messenger could not speculate further than θεός (ll. 1623-28):

> ἦν μὲν σιωπή, φθέγμα δ' ἐξαίφνης τινὸς
> θώυξεν αὐτόν, ὥστε πάντας ὀρθίας
> στῆσαι φόβῳ δείσαντας εὐθέως τρίχας·
> καλεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν πολλὰ πολλαχῇ θεός·
> 'ὦ οὗτος οὗτος, Οἰδίπους, τί μέλλομεν
> χωρεῖν; πάλαι δὴ τἀπὸ σοῦ βραδύνεται.'

From the passage in the *OC* the following elements are clear: there is a delay of the death of Oidipous and the gods have to intervene twice. This intervention has a double function; firstly, it precipitates the death of the hero and, secondly, it allows the gods to show their special interest in the man. This is vital, especially because the hero is an ambiguous figure in myth, a man who has been polluted by his marriage to his own mother, and is now rejected by his former friends. The divine intervention, narrated to the audience by the messenger, restores him to his status.

The god whose voice is heard is never specified in this passage.[49] The familiarity between the god and the hero (cf. ὦ οὗτος οὗτος, Οἰδίπους) underlines the contrast of the impersonality of divine power, as far as the other characters are concerned, and the intimacy between this power and the hero.[50] This is evidently a god whom Oidipous knows all too well, although he remains unidentified by the other characters and, as a

[49] Kamerbeek (1984: 220) thinks Charon to be less likely than Hermes (cf. *OC* 1548), for example.

[50] Kamerbeek (1984: 220). It should be noted that Athena addresses Aias in a similar way twice in S. *Aj.* 71 (οὗτος); 89 (ὦ οὗτος). Garvie (1998: 131) notes that the use of this nominative is rare in tragedy and that Sophokles only uses it seven times.

result, by the audience. Moreover, the verb that the god employs in first person plural points to a partnership of the two in order to achieve their means (τί μέλλομεν χωρεῖν;).[51] Perhaps there is no need for the audience to know who this god is, no need to know more than the fact that the gods treat Oidipous with affection, and, therefore, do not consider him polluted. Besides, the anonymity of the god adds substantially to the element of mystery and wonder in this scene. The example of the *OC* points to a way of achieving divine restoration, with no *deus ex machina* intervention, of a formerly dishonoured and rejected figure. In the case of the *OC*, this restoration comes to complement an existing at the time hero-cult of Oidipous, as this would have been known to fifth-century Athenians. (There is no need to suppose that this cult would require that Oidipous was unusually virtuous, in the sense that Christian saints, for example, are. A cult-hero was mainly expected to be powerful; he could help his friends as easily as he could harm his enemies. Mikalson notes how dread, fear and awe surrounded hero-cults in ancient Greece.[52])

Oidipous, like Aias, had his own hero cult that was related to Athens in particular,[53] and which was visibly implied in the *OC*.[54] This is not the only occasion in fifth-century drama, where the audience witnesses on-stage the process of making a new hero and initiating a new cult, already established in real-life. The *apotheosis* of Herakles in

[51] Garland (1992: 168-70) considers the plural to suggest the sacred union of god and hero.

[52] Mikalson (1991: 39-41); Antonaccio (1995: 1).

[53] See Kearns (1989: 208-9; 189); Edmunds (1981: 221-38); Henrichs (1983: 94). See, moreover, Wilson (1997: 179-185), for similarities between Aias and Oidipous and the establishment of their cults.

[54] See, for example, Markantonatos (2002: 208-19); Blundell (1989: 253-4); Henrichs (1983: 94-5).

Sophokles' *Trachiniai*,[55] the end of Hippolytos in Euripides' *Hippolytos* (cf. ll. 1423-30),[56] as well as the references to the cult of Aias in Sophokles' *Aias* (cf. pp. 80-1), all point to cults that the Athenians would be aware of.

Two more examples of narrated off-stage vocal epiphanies are found in Euripides' *Andromache* and *Bakkhai*. In the *Bakkhai* (l. 1078) the messenger bringing the news of the death of Pentheus noted how a divine voice, probably that of Dionysos, had instructed the Maenads to kill Pentheus:[57] ἐκ δ' αἰθέρος φωνή τις, ὡς μὲν εἰκάσαι / Διόνυσος, ἀνεβόησεν. In Euripides' *Andromache* 1147-9, the messenger also speaks of an unidentified mysterious voice that encouraged the army to go to battle: πρὶν δή τις ἀδύτων ἐκ μέσων ἐφθέγξατο / δεινόν τι καὶ φρικῶδες, ὥρσε δὲ στρατὸν / στρέψας πρὸς ἀλκήν.

Real-life epiphanies

Epiphany was not something unknown in the historical experience of the Athenians,[58] and cases of attested epiphany were, in fact, often related to the initiation of a hero-cult.[59] There are indications that in the mid sixth century epiphanies were not considered improbable (cf. the staged epiphany by Peisistratos in Hrdt 1.60.3-5), and the same appears to have been the case during the years of the Persian wars, when many

[55] Easterling (1981: 65-66); Holt (1989: 76-9).

[56] See Barrett (1964: 412-3).

[57] Dodds (1944: 212); Seaford (1996: 236) note the similarities to the passage of the *OC*.

[58] Harrison (2000: 92); Sourvinou-Inwood (2003: 460).

[59] For examples, see Hornblower (1996: 356); Garland (1992: 47-63); Parker (1996: 163-5); Harrison (2000: 82-7).

epiphanies were attested during battles (Plu. *Them.* 30; Paus. 1.32.5; Hrdt. 6.117.2-3). In the examples from Pausanias, the epiphany remained unidentified until the instructions of an oracle that the hero Echetlaios should be worshipped. In Herodotos, the testimonies for the epiphany speak of an unidentified man. Apparently, it was not implausible to suggest that you witnessed an epiphany in fifth-century reality, without being able to identify the god/hero who made this appearance. The example in Euripides' *Andromache* 1147-9, mentioned above, is reminiscent of real life epiphanies during battles, as the Athenians themselves would have witnessed them.[60] Having examined the possibility for unidentified epiphanies, narrated in messenger speeches, both in tragedy and in Athenian reality, we may now return to the reference in the *Threissai*.

The possibility for an off-stage epiphany in the Threissai

This section will argue that the reference to the *Threissai* in the Sophoklean scholia suggests that this was not the trivial assignment of a mortal act/state to some completely undefined god/daemon, but the narration of something that was to be perceived as an off-stage epiphany, a miracle of some kind, not that different from what happens in the *OC*. The crucial indication that makes the reference for the *Threissai* a witnessed testimony and not a speculation that does not require an epiphany is the phrase τις παροῦσα δαίμων. The daemon in the referred occasion is not the usual completely general and undefined one, but a female and one that the messenger suggests was somehow present.[61]

[60] For examples of heroes saving cities in times of war, see Kearns (1989: 44-56); Kron (1999: 61-83).

[61] The word is clearly read in the scholia. See Christodoulou (1977: 190-1). The use of the word παροῦσα in *TrGF* iii fr. 83 is very different from the use of the male participle in the cliché phrase that points to Fate (cf. S. *El.* 1306; A. *Pers.* 825; E. *Alc.* 561; *And.* 974)

Never in the cases of reflex and uninformed speculation of unidentified divine intervention is the daemon specified as female, and nowhere is the fact of daemon's presence so clearly implied.[62] There would have been no need for the messenger to assign this to a female goddess unless he had some evidence for the gender, such as her actual presence. The female daemon could be visible to Aias but not to the messenger. Gods and goddesses are more likely to be recognised when seen, because they have attributes. The absence of recognition by the messenger may well indicate that he hears but does not see: possibly he hears Aias address an unidentified goddess in a vague way (e.g. with the term *anassa*). A good example of restriction of a messenger's knowledge is the case of the messenger in the *OC*.[63]

Female presence in visual representations of Aias' death

There is a female presence indicated in relation to the corpse of Aias in early fifth-century visual arts. There is the case of an early fifth-century scarab, mentioned earlier (*LIMC* Aias 141), which presents a winged goddess covering the dead Aias.[64] According to Davies, a possible explanation could be that this was a mortal woman, who was given the wings because of the wish of the painter to fill the gap on the vase. Another possibility is that the painter could have mistaken the scene as depicting Eos and Memnon whereas a third possibility is that the painter could have known Aischylos *TrGF*

[62] Note A. *Pers.* 725: μέγας τις ἦλθε δαίμων ὥστε μὴ φρονεῖν καλῶς. The verb ἦλθε could point to the physical presence of the unidentified god, but it is related to a vague act, often performed by gods (the loss of someone's ability to think logically), and does not require that the god is present to perform it.

[63] Goward (1999: 183-4, n. 23) discusses extensively all the restrictions involved in this messenger scene.

[64] Davies (1973: 63-6, pl. 9.3).

iii fr. 83 and misunderstood the role of the goddess there.[65] The latter explanation seems to us more plausible, not in the sense that the performance of the play influenced the vase, but in the sense that this minor tradition of the hero's death, involving both the invulnerability and the divine concern for the hero, was attested in the early fifth century.

There is, moreover, a woman covering Aias' corpse on the scene depicted by the Brygos painter (*LIMC* Aias 140), dated to the same years as *LIMC* Aias 141. There are two additional scenes connected with Aias on *LIMC* 140; the Achaeans voting (*LIMC* 83) and the two heroes, Aias and Odysseus, having a fight over the weapons (*LIMC* 72).[66] Do these indicate the existence of a complete story that was depicted by the painter, and was this the story as told in the *Threissai*? There are two objections against this view that should be mentioned. It is probable that in Aischylos it was Thetis and not the Achaeans who judged, and, secondly, there is no indication that in Aischylos any mortal woman was present. The vase is, therefore, difficult to accommodate within the range of the possible influence of the *Threissai*, unless the vase painter is conflating traditions, although this again would not help us in reconstructing the plot of the *Threissai*. (The vase pre-dates Sophokles but its version is very close to what the poet presents in his *Aias*.[67]) Nevertheless, we can see that there was a female presence allowed in the story as

[65] Davies (1973: 64-5).

[66] Davies (1973: 67-9, respectively pll. 10.1; 10.2).

[67] Sophokles' first appearance and simultaneous victory in the theatre is dated to 468 B.C. See *TrGF* iii *testimonium* 57.

early as the beginning of the fifth century,[68] perhaps with variants, but always as the expression of affection towards the dying or dead hero.

In later years, iconography identified a goddess that was related to the end of Aias as Athena. Davies notes two cases in iconographical tradition where Athena speaks to the hero who is about to die and connects it to the armpit tradition. The former is a stamnos from Palermo (*LIMC* Aias 107) of the late fifth century, where Athena steps on a dead animal and a winged Charon is also present. The second is an Etruscan mirror of the early fourth century B.C., on which the image of the bent sword is visible (*LIMC* Aias 135).[69] This need not necessarily be closely related to the version of Aischylos and should not be taken to mean that the poet implied this (and the scholiast omitted it); it is rather more probable that the audience and the vase-painters would speculate on the identity of the goddess or that another source that repeated the motif, named her. As a result, the vases could point to a conflation of versions, or to the vivid imagination of the painters who inserted the goddess in this role.

Though we cannot hope to identify the female daemon of *TrGF* iii 83 with certainty, there is good reason to entertain the possibility that it was Athena. The suggestive vagueness related to the goddess (suggestive in that divine status and gender are given but not name) would stimulate speculation on the part of the audience. It should also be noted that the messenger scene was not independent and that it is not impossible that

[68] Kamerbeek (1953: 10) sees Tekmessa as an invention of Sophokles, but there might have been a precedent of female presence in Aias' story in tradition.

[69] Davies (1971: 154, respectively pll. 48.1; 48.3).

other passages in the play pointed towards the identity of the figure. In Sophokles' *OC* 1547-8, for example, there is an unidentified female goddess who, along with Hermes, accompanies the hero to the underworld (ἥ τε νερτέρα θεός) and in *OC* 1568 there is a reference to a group of female goddesses (χθόνιαι θεαί). It has been suggested, tentatively, that this refers to Persephone in the first occasion, and Demeter and Kore or to the Eumenides in the latter case.[70] In the present case, unlike the messenger the audience has its knowledge of Athenian myth, history and cult and knows that Aias was loosely associated with the city of Athena.

The brief scholion that preserved *TrGF* iii fr. 83 points to a narration of Aias' suicide in Aischylos with the following elements: the repeated unsuccessful efforts of the hero, his unawareness of his single vulnerable spot, his steadfast resolve to die[71] and some form of divine information concerning his vulnerable spot. This is probably a condensed version of what the audience of Aischylos would have heard, evidently in a longer, and perhaps more vivid, narration. Aischylos was fond of vivid and circumstantial narrations (cf. the narration of the shields in the *Seven*). Messenger speeches are common in tragedy.[72] Goward has argued for the enormous potential that narrative opens in comparison to stage-action, among which she lists the potential to describe the supernatural as, for

[70] Markantonatos (2002: 216).

[71] It should not be considered implausible that perhaps Aias, in his agony, even asked for some kind of divine help. In Sophokles' *Aias* the hero prays to Hermes to make his death quick and effortless (ll. 831-4).

[72] For a discussion of the form and function of anonymous messenger speeches in tragedy, see Taplin (1977: 81-3); Goward (1999: 21-7). See Barrett (2004: 235-54), for a discussion on the Aischylean messenger speeches.

example, the death of Oidipous in the *OC*.[73] To conclude, the narration of the death of Aias in Aischylos would have been very different from the brief and on-stage presented death of Aias in Sophokles, which will be later discussed.

Restoring Aias

The dishonour of Aias and the prohibition of a proper burial are passed over in silence in the *Odyssey*. No guilt for the Achaeans or Odysseus himself is suggested in relation to what happened. Odysseus tries to pass over the problem that the prohibition of the burial entails by mentioning the grief of the Achaeans for the loss of the hero (cf. *Od.* 11.556-8: σεῖο δ' Ἀχαιοὶ / ἶσον Ἀχιλλῆος κεφαλῇ Πηληϊάδαο / ἀχνύμεθα φθιμένοιο διαμπερές). The *Odyssey* is probably trying to present its main hero under a positive light, without being necessarily interested in justifying Aias.

The case was different in fifth-century B.C. Athens, where Aias was one of the most prominent heroes with his own cult.[74] His establishment as a fifth-century cult-hero was probably the result of a long procedure with two main steps. The first step took place in the late sixth century, and probably for political reasons. Athens and Megara were rivals over the possession of Salamis for more than a hundred years and their dispute ceased in

[73] Goward (1999: 16-20).

[74] See March (1991-3: 3; 25-6); Shapiro (1989: 154-7); Burian (1972: 151); Kearns (1989: 141-2); Mikalson (1991: 30). See, moreover, Kearns (*ibid.*: 1-9), for the terminology of the word 'hero'. For archaeological evidence for hero-cults, see Burkert (1997: 15-34); Antonaccio (1995: 145-97).

the late sixth century in favour of Athens.[75] In those years, the Athenians gave the name of Aias to one of the ten tribes, the Aiantis, and Aias' statue was erected in the agora as the eponymous hero of the tribe (cf. Paus. 1.5.1-2; Hrdt. 5.66). The second step in this establishment of Aias in Athens took place in the years of the Persian wars. The Athenians believed that he helped them in the battle of Salamis in 480 B.C. (cf. Hrdt. 8.64; Plu. *Them.* 15). Following the crucial battle, one of the triremes was dedicated to the hero (Hrdt. 8.121) and his festival at Salamis, the Aianteia, was expanded.[76] Furthermore, the two sons of Aias, Eurysakes and Philaios, were considered Athenian citizens (cf. Plu. *Sol.* 10; Paus. 1.35.1) and distinguished Athenians claimed descent from them (Pherekydes *FGH* 3 fr. 2). Aias enjoyed special status in fifth-century Athens and it was likely, if by no means inevitable, that his disgrace, as found in the epic cycle (cf. *PEG Little Iliad testimonium* 3) with the denial of a proper burial, could be made good.[77]

This is also implied in one of the surviving tragedies. Sophokles' *Aias* clears Aias' name and honours him as a hero with a proper burial and with subtle references to his cult; the scene where the young Eurysakes supplicates his dead father, whose corpse has the powers that an asylum has, points to the Athenian cult of the hero.[78] This, however, is

[75] Shapiro (1989: 154) sees Aias as the clearest example of an epic hero in Attica being pressed into the service of political propaganda between two rival cities. For the role of heroes as focuses of group identity in tragedy with the objective to create Athenian history, see Parker (2005: 446-51).

[76] Shapiro (1989: 157).

[77] Price and Kearns (2003: 11 intro.) note how the emphasis in a myth can occasionally be shifted to serve local preoccupations.

[78] Burian (1972: 151-155); Henrichs (1993: 166-8; 175); Taplin (1978: 65; 108-9); Mikalson (1991: 219); Easterling (1988: 92-4); Segal (1981: 143); Blundell (1989: 93).

not central to the play (as in the case of the *OC*).[79] Aias' special connection to Athens is stressed (S. *Aj.* 861; 1217-21), and his restoration in the play occurs in the context of fifth-century Athens. This need not necessarily constitute the first Athenian attempt for a restoration of the hero. It should be considered that perhaps it was Aischylos who first put this restoration into action,[80] for exactly the same reasons.

The first indication that we have to the direction of Aias' restoration is the attitude of the gods towards the hero, specifically through their assistance in his suicide as described by Aischylos. The gods apparently have forgiven any wrongdoing of his. In this case, the gods embrace Aias in a way that the mortals do not. Aias dies without his former friends but he does not die alone, as in Sophokles. The divine *charis* of the gods in Aischylos, as well as the fact that the Achaeans do not judge (cf. pp. 52-4) and, therefore, do not reject Aias in the judgment of weapons, would be a kind of vindication for a hero particularly loved in Athens. Aias is deprived of the weapons because of an individual, a devious opponent, not because of the collective, and is then restored by gods, who know better. The invulnerability that we come across in the *Threissai* could have been created, or at least used, with the objective to motivate the divine intervention and, ultimately, allow this sort of restoration.

[79] Blundell (1989: 93, n. 167).

[80] The scholiast on S. *Aj.* 815a allows the possibility that the play of Aischylos pre-existed that of Sophokles when discussing how the younger poet presented the suicide of Aias: ἴσως οὖν καινοτομεῖν βουλόμενος (sc. Sophokles) καὶ μὴ κατακολουθεῖν τοῖς ἑτέρου <ἴχνεσιν>, ὑπ' ὄψιν ἔθηκε τὸ δρώμενον ἢ μᾶλλον ἐκπλῆξαι βουλόμενος.

It is plausible that the characters and the audience were to perceive the messenger's narration in the *Threissai* as an expression of divine concern for Aias. The place of Aias in Athenian cult would have been a motive, though this need not be the sole motive. The need to be original when presenting an old story on stage could be another motive, or a supplementary one.

The real-life testimonies for divine epiphanies during the Persian war, as well as in other cases, could further help us in understanding the potential perception of a proposed epiphany by the members of Aischylos' audience. In addition, the way in which Sophokles handles two restorations of fallen heroes in his surviving corpus could also give us a clue: the restoration of Oidipous (with divine means: an off-stage epiphany) and of Aias (with mortal means: the consent to a proper burial) suggest that this sort of restoration was totally acceptable on fifth-century stage. Though heroes need not be good, versions of the myth which presented Aias in a broadly favourable light would perhaps be particularly welcome in the city which honoured him. The fact that there are indications for a positive interest in Aias' story in Pindar's *I.* 4.35-43 (dated to 474-3? B.C.)[81] and *N.* 7.23-33 (dated to 485?),[82] shows a preference of the poet for Aias over Odysseus concerning the weapons' issue. These brief references could imply, if not necessarily an extensive text pre-dating them, at least an audience ready for this restoration. The same is the case with the scarabeus (*LIMC* Aias 140) of the early fifth century (mentioned earlier) presenting a winged goddess covering the dead Aias.

[81] As dated by Snell and Maehler (1987: 144).

[82] As dated by Snell and Maehler (1987: 121).

The burial question

There is, furthermore, the question of Aias' burial. If the prohibition of the burial was included in the Aischylean tragedy, as is in the Sophoklean, then this could be the first occasion where one comes across the dispute about whether the hero should be buried or not – though the nature of his burial was already an issue in epic. There is an interesting piece of information in the scholia on Sophokles' *Aias* 134a, where the scholiast compares the appropriateness of the chorus of Salaminians, as found in Sophokles, to Aischylos' chorus of Thracian women:

> πιθανῶς αὐτῷ ὁ χορὸς ἐσκεύασται ἀπὸ Σαλαμινίων ἀνδρῶν τοῦτο μὲν παρρησιαζομένων ὡς ἐλευθέρων τοῦτο δὲ συμπαθῶς ἐχόντων ὡς πολιτῶν καὶ αἰδημόνως λαλούντων ὡς ὑπηκόων· οὐ γὰρ πιθανὸν ἐξ Ἀχαιῶν εἰσάγειν καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ὄντως συνάχθεσθαι καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ προσκρούειν τῷ βασιλεῖ. τὸ δὲ τῶν αἰχμαλώτων κηδεμονικὸν μέν, ὡς Αἰσχύλος ἐν Θρῄσσαις, οὐ μὴν εὐπρόσωπον· ὅρα γὰρ οἷον αἰχμαλώτους ἐπιτιμᾶν τῷ Μενελάῳ.

The reason why the female captives revile Menelaos is not mentioned in the passage, but this could be related to the chorus' reaction to the decision to prevent the burial of Aias, perhaps announced to them by Menelaos. This would be the obvious cause of conflict, though not certain. If the chorus had both the role of the mourner (according to the scholia)[83] and that of the opponent of Menelaos, then the female captives would have a very important role in the play. This coheres with what is seen in other plays of Aischylos, where powerful choruses play an important role. It is noteworthy that both the *Agamemnon* and the *Eumenides* end with an epirrhematic scene where the chorus

[83] Taplin (1977: 178, n. 3) considers the play to be among those where the lament is mostly choral.

reproaches and laments, and the chorus of the *Persai* also holds a vital role in the play. The scholion could imply that the chorus would take the place of Aias' defender, perhaps his sole defender. (There are no testimonies that Teukros is present in the *Threissai*). Would the chorus in the *Threissai* achieve permission for the burial? Additional help could perhaps come from the messenger and the declaration of the gods' support to the dying Aias.

There is another parameter concerning the denial of the burial that should be considered. Suicide in ancient Greece was occasionally a reason for the denial of a burial.[84] In tragedy, however, suicide is an understandable way to react to social pressure, and suicides are generally viewed with sympathy.[85] In Aias' case the connection of the suicide with the prohibition of the burial is only suggested by Philostratos (*Her.* 35.15), as noted by Holt,[86] but his testimony is not enough to erase all other instances where the suicide is connected with what was considered to be treason.[87] It is further suggested in Sophokles that Aias was more of an enemy to the Achaeans than the Trojans were (S. *Aj.* 1052-4). It is safe to conclude that in the play Aias was treated as a traitor and not as a polluted person because he committed suicide. There are, furthermore, cases of

[84] See Bremmer (1983: 95-6); Garrison (1991: 1-20); Holt (1992: 326) on how the bodies of those who committed suicide were treated.

[85] Garrison (1991: 20-1).

[86] Holt (1992: 326, n. 19).

[87] Garland (1985: 97) notes the omission of the suicide issue from the discussions about the burial of Aias.

punishment of a traitor's corpse in many tragedies, as for example S. *Ant.* 26-30; 198-210; *Aj.* 1061-90; A. *Th.* 1013-25, E. *Ph.* 775-6; 1628-34.[88]

The distinctive difference between the Aischylean Aias and all other cases of traitors in tragedy is that the gods would not be in any way polluted by a man that they had helped commit suicide. For this reason, the Aias of Aischylos cannot be a *hybristes*, as the Aias of Sophokles is (ll. 128-9; 766-9; 774-5).[89] In the *Aias*, the hero is hated by gods and men (ll. 457-8). There, it is Odysseus, who is a model of proper religious behaviour, as opposed to Aias and the Atreidai.[90]

To summarise, the *Threissai* would include the disappointment of the hero at not winning the weapons of Achilleus and his hatred against Odysseus (who might have used his invulnerability to deprive him of the ultimate prize). Although the madness is not attested in what survives, judging from its presence in the epic cycle, it probably was part of the story.[91] The shame that this would bring to Aias would drive him to take the decision to die. A messenger would give a detailed description of his unsuccessful attempts to kill himself until the intervention of a goddess. The chorus of women from

[88] See discussions in Hutchinson (1985: 212-3); Mastronarde (1994: 609). See, moreover, p. 256 for the treatment of corpses of traitors in Athens of the fifth century B.C.

[89] See Garvie (1998: 12).

[90] As suggested by Mikalson (1991: 144).

[91] Mette (1963: 124) suggests that an *adespoton* fragment (*TrGF* ii fr. 110) comes from a speech of Aias before his suicide in the *Threissai*. The fragment reads: ΑΙΑΣ· οὐκ ἦν ἄρ' οὐδὲν πῆμ' ἐλευθέρου δάκνον /ψυχὴν ὁμοίως ἀνδρὸς ὡς ἀτιμία. / οὑγὼ πέπονθα καὶ με †συμφοροῦσα† / βαθεῖα κηλὶς ἐκ βυθῶν ἀναστρέφει / λύσσης πικροῖς κέντροισιν ἠρεθισμένον. Dishonour and madness are mentioned in the fragment and it is not implausible to connect these with Aias. But there is no secure evidence for the assignment of the fragment to a specific play.

Thrace would have the mourning role following the arrival of the suicide news. They may have defended the hero's right to a proper burial, if the possibility of withholding burial was raised.

If the hero was restored through an off-stage epiphany, as we suspect, then Aischylos, as in many other cases, adapted the mythical story to fifth-century reality. Aias is no longer the distant and dishonoured hero of epic tradition, rejected both by mortals and gods, but he becomes the hero that the Athenians know from contemporary cult and history. Late sixth and early fifth-century Athenian politics had stimulated the creation of Aias' cult, and, as a result, this cult aroused among the public positive feelings towards the hero. Aischylos, by rehabilitating Aias through tragedy, gave this hero-cult an appropriate mythical background. This is in accordance with a tendency of Aischylos to re-write mythical stories by adding contemporary elements that would allow his audience to understand the myths through their own experiences. Aischylos appears to be consciously transforming the stories through the prism of fifth-century Athens and he creates new stories based on the old myths.

The *Salaminiai*

The lack of fragments and testimonia

The *Salaminiai* is the most obscure of the Aischylean Aias plays. The catalogue has *Salaminioi* but surviving *TrGF* iii fragments 216-20, hardly a whole line, are all attested under the female form of the title. A female chorus probably points to the action taking place at the homeland of the hero rather than at Troy and could be related to the mourning after his death, for which a female chorus would be especially appropriate. *TrGF* iii fr. 216: εἴ μοι γένοιτο φᾶρος ἶσον οὐρανῷ, made Garvie suggest that the cloak motif that we find in Sophokles' *Aias* 915-6 when Tekmessa covers the dead hero, was already present in Aischylos and suggests that the same was the case in epos.[92] However, the cloak of *TrGF* iii fr. 216 possibly refers to a present need rather than a retrospective one, and it could be used by a character in this play to conceal his face because of immense grief. The motif has been used by Aischylos in other cases, for example in the case of Achilleus and Niobe (pp. 101-2). The rest of the fragments are simply of lexicographical interest. The lack of any evidence for the story of this play makes it rather difficult to speak of the plot of the play in any detail.

Is Teukros the archer hero of the *Iliad* and is this the play in which Aischylos presented his lion-hearted Teukros, whom we come across in Aristophanes (cf. *Ra.* 1041)?[93] The

[92] Garvie (1998: 4).

[93] The trilogy on Achilleus could also be considered a candidate to contain a reference to a brave Teukros because it narrates the story of the last books of the *Iliad*, and it could refer to a number of battles and excelling warriors.

play is usually taken to revolve around the return of Teukros to Salamis.[94] A brief summary of the story is found in Euripides' *Helene* (ll. 87-150). Telamon considered Teukros responsible for the death of his brother and expelled him from the country. Teukros received an oracle that instructed him to go to Cyprus and to establish there a new city that he was to name Salamis. The story is vaguely referred to in the *Aias* of Sophokles, when Teukros expresses his fear of what is to follow when his father learns the news (ll. 1008-20). Nowhere is the story told extensively in what survives,[95] but from bits and pieces we can discern small variations as far as what the accusation against Teukros was.[96]

In ancient Greek drama there were plays titled *Teukros* by Ion (*TrGF* i 19 frs. 34-5), Nicomachos (*TrGF* i 127 fr. 10), Euaretos (*TrGF* i 85) and, most importantly, by Sophokles. Among these lost plays only the latter, Sophokles' *Teukros*, counts a few surviving fragments (*TrGF* iv frs. 576-79b) that could possibly help us to understand its story. The play was presented before 423 B.C., as is made evident by the preservation of *TrGF* iv fr. 578 in Aristophanes (cf. *Nu.* 583).

---

[94] See p. 46.

[95] The story would have been part of the *Nostoi*, but the summary of Proklos on the latter makes no reference to Teukros, Telamon or Salamis. However, Proklos should be used as a positive indicator and not a negative one because of the vast amount of material that he had to cover in a short summary. Things are not clear with the lost *Nostoi* of Stesichoros either, but the story was probably mentioned there. The story was partially and briefly presented by lyric poets, for instance Pi. *N.* 4. 46-7, but it is mostly known from later sources.

[96] The story's outline survives in Paus. 8.15.6-7; Verg. *Aen.*1.619-22; schol. A. *Pers.* 894; schol. Lykophron 447; 450; 462; schol. Pi. *N.*4.76. Also notable is a damaged scholion on Ibyc. *PMG* 282(a) that somebody,]ιμαχος is all that survives, wrote on Teukros.

There is no more evidence concerning the Aischylean *Salaminiai* and speculation will take us no further.

Reception

Sophokles' *Aias*

The comparison of the plays on Aias by Aischylos and Sophokles can be very helpful, if only to better understand Sophokles and evaluate his talent in taking a myth told by Aischylos in a way that might have made a strong impression at the time, and turning in into a different story.

One of the evident differences between the two plays would have been the way in which the suicide of the hero was conducted. In Aischylos the suicide efforts of Aias are long and strenuous, but, conversely, the suicide in Sophokles is instant: Aias dies with one fatal blow, after praying to Hermes to make his death quick and effortless (S. *Aj.* 833). The invulnerability of Aischylos' version, which caused the delay of the suicide, is omitted by Sophokles, who briefly mentions that the hero hit himself at the *pleura*, which is broadly consistent with the armpit tradition (cf. schol. S. *Aj.* 833a).

In Aischylos, there is possibly a goddess present at the side of Aias when he commits suicide, and there is also the messenger, who is to bring the news on stage, watching; in Sophokles, in contrast, the hero dies all alone. There is nobody present to witness his suicide or his last words, apart from the audience. This brings us to the next important differentiation of Sophokles from the Aischylean version: the suicide is narrated in Aischylos, as is usually the case with deaths in tragedy, but is, surprisingly, put on stage

by Sophokles. Death on stage is, as far as we know, very rare in Greek drama.[97] Of course, it is not necessary that the death would take place in full view, even if it was taking place on stage.[98] The suicide could have been somehow partly concealed.[99] This is the most evident example of Sophokles' innovative approach to the version of Aischylos. Sophokles not only writes a very dissimilar version of the suicide, but, most importantly, he brings this completely different suicide (quick, painless, with no divine intervention) in front of the audience's eyes.

The choice to present Aias, all alone, committing suicide on stage has implications for Sophokles' choices concerning the restoration of the hero. For an audience that was familiar with Aischylos' version, where the gods had (according to the reconstruction adopted above) expressed their sympathy for Aias by helping him to die, the absence of such intervention in Sophokles would have been a surprise. In Sophokles, the hero dies without having escaped dishonour, and without any indication that he will be later

[97] Evadne in Euripides' *Hiketides* (cf. l. 1071) also commits suicide on stage. The fragments of the lost *Niobe* of Sophokles (cf. *TrGF* iv frs. 441a-451) allow a partly witnessed on-stage death of some of the girls of the heroine at the hands of Apollon and Artemis.

[98] A reference in Hesychios, s.u. συσπαστόν or ἀνδρόμητον, speaks of a theatrical sword that ran into itself and was used in performances of the *Aias*. This need not necessarily refer to the original performance of the play. See Kamerbeek (1953: 168); Arnott (1962: 131). Moreover, according to the scholia on *Aias* 815, an actor named Timotheos from Zakynthos was nicknamed as ὁ σφαγεύς after performing this scene. This, if implying a full-view suicide, could also refer to revivals of the play. See Else (1957: 357, n. 39); Stanford (1954: 173-4). Note that Sri Pathmanathan (1965: 14) speaks of a full-view suicide.

[99] For suggestions, based on S. *Aj.* 892, that the suicide is in fact somewhat screened by bushes, perhaps painted panels, see Kamerbeek (1953: 167-8); Stanford (1963: 165-6; 173-4); Else (1957: 357, n. 39). Gardiner (1979-80: 10), however, speaks of an off-stage suicide. See Scullion (1994: 89-128) for a thorough discussion on the presentation of the suicide and especially (*ibid.*: 116-28) the conclusions reached.

restored. It is clear that Sophokles follows a completely different course of restoration. The audience would gradually realise that restoration would be achieved this time too, but through other means. As opposed to the divine restoration that seems to have taken place in Aischylos, the Sophoklean restoration of Aias comes from the magnanimity of Odyssseus, a mortal who was formerly the enemy of the hero.

Sophokles invents a new way of solving the crisis of leaving Aias in dishonour, shifting all the weight to the burial issue. This also corresponds to the fact that in Sophokles the weapons are denied to Aias by the Achaeans; Aias has been disgraced by mortals during the judgment of Achilleus' weapons, and is finally restored by them. In both cases, the eloquence of Odysseus is important for the decision of the collective, though in different ways. Sophokles presents Odysseus in the *Aias* under a very positive light, which is very different from the reference to Odysseus in the *Threissai* (cf. *TrGF* iii fr. 175).

Sophokles' play apparently invited comparison with its Aischylean predecessor. This was clearly understood by ancient scholiasts, as well; it is no coincidence that almost all of our surviving information on the *Threissai* comes from the scholia on Sophokles' *Aias*. It was natural that in fifth-century Athens the competition among tragedians who presented plays written on the same myths would stimulate innovative treatments of the stories, in order to make an impression on the audience.[100] To meet the challenge of a previous version of the story that met with success, and was perhaps established to some degree in the public memory, the playwright would have to go a step further, to make a

[100] Davies (1998: 402) suggests that the poets, who treated the same legendary themes, wanted to draw attention to their own novel treatment.

sensation, even to reach the limits of his dramatic art. This is, in part, what Sophokles does by having Aias merge the sword in his *pleura* on stage, in front of the eyes of a surprised audience, unfamiliar with such spectacles in theatre in general, and familiar with a completely different version of Aias' death.

Rome and *the Armorum Iudicium*

There is no other known tragedy on the judgment of weapons in Greece. There are, however, two such tragedies in Rome. The *Hoplon Krisis* undoubtedly influenced, in one way or another, the two tragedies titled *Armorum Iudicium.*[101] Pacuvius (220-130 B.C.) and Accius (170-86 B.C.), each wrote a tragedy with this title. There is one thing that is made immediately evident when looking at the fragments from both of these tragedies. The story in both cases includes, apart from the judgment, the suicide of Aias and the dispute over his burial. This would probably cause a reduction in the space devoted to these incidents in order to present them both in a single play.

Pacuvius was the first to write on this story. We cannot say to what degree he adapted the *Hoplon Krisis* and to what degree he simply translated.[102] Pacuvius speaks of funeral games in fr. 30 (W) and the judgment of Achilleus' weapons could have been part of Achilleus' funeral games, as in *Od*yssey 24, where Thetis initiated these games.[103] Fr. 45

[101] For more on the reception of Greek drama in Rome, see pp. 315-9.

[102] Valsa (1957: 11) notes that the *Antiope* of Pacuvious and the *Medea* of Ennius were translated word by word, based on Cicero's testimony (*De Fin.* 1.2).

[103] Mariotti (1960: 27) suggests that this was also the case in Aischylos.

(W) is probably spoken by a betrayed Aias (*Men servasse ut essent qui me perderent?*) and allows the possibility that it was the leaders of the army who took the decision to deprive Aias of the weapons. Apparently, Agamemnon made the decision, upon somebody's advice, to appoint Greek judges (frs. 36-40 W). Frs. 32, 34-5 (W) suggest that Aias spoke with contempt of Odysseus and his pretended madness before joining the Achaean campaign. Fragments 41-3 (W) imply that a messenger brought the news of the judgment since it was probably narrated and not presented on stage (this is a departure from Aischylos). There are few fragments from the second part of Pacuvius' play, and this makes it difficult to trace the possible influence of Aischylos. Fr. 45 (W) is probably from the last speech of Aias before committing suicide, and fr. 46 (W) refers to the denial of funeral rites. The *Armorum Iudicium* of Pacuvius must have been quite popular in Rome because more than a century later it was still known to the public. In fact it was so well-known that the people would understand the meaning of fr. 45, when it was recited for the death of Julius Caesar in 44 B.C. to signal what was the connecting link between the stories of Aias and Caesar: the betrayal by former friends.[104]

Accius was younger than Pacuvius. D'Antó says that Accius in his *Armorum Iudicium* (frs. 96-130 W) not only used the Greek tragedy of Aischylos as a model, but drew on Pacuvius' work as well.[105] There are also elements that remind one of Sophokles' *Aias*, especially in the second part of the play. As far as his judgment of weapons is concerned,

[104] The line was preserved by Suetonius *De Vita Caesarum: Div. Iul.* 84. 2. During Caesar's funeral in 44 B.C. this line was recited, *ad miserationem et invidiam caedis eius accommodata, ex Pacuvi Armorum Iudicio.*

[105] D'Antó (1980: 258-9). Note that D' Antó (*ibid.*: 87-90) does not edit all of the above fragments.

fragments 103-8, 109-14 (W) prove that Aias stated his own case extensively, pointing out his valour and his very strong feelings against Odysseus, insisting on his foe's pretended folly before joining the campaign. Fr. 118 (W), *hem, vereor plus quam fas est captivam hiscere*, points either to a chorus of female barbarian prisoners or to Tekmessa, and could point to cyclic influence (*PEG Little Iliad* fr. 2), if these females were the judges. Apart from its title, there is, in fact, no indication that the play was influenced by Aischylos, except that an Aias who states his case for the arms owes more to Aischylos than to Sophokles, and so one may be able to hazard the view that this is a play which blended elements of both playwrights. Fr. 119 (W) is a part of Aias' speech about his imminent death and fr. 122 (W) clearly alludes to his madness. The rest of the fragments have indications that relate them to the play of Sophokles. Fr. 123 (W), where Aias addresses his young son and fragments 127- 8 (W), where the Atreidai are reconciled with Teukros (after a disagreement on the burial question, by Odysseus), are reminiscent of the *Aias*.

Not much more can be said, but it seems that the first part of both plays titled *Armorum Iudicium* was closer to the Aischylean play than the second part for the obvious reason that there are no other known Greek plays presenting the judgment of weapons. The absence of a known play on the judgment of the weapons by Sophokles or Euripides, or other poets, allows the possibility that Aischylos is likely to have been the inspiration for the Latin plays.[106] The second part that presented the death and burial of the hero had more than one source. In Rome the story of Aias' death and burial was popular. Livius

[106] See p. 325, for the amount of lost to us titles of fifth-century tragedies.

Andronicus also wrote an *Aiax Mastigophorus*.[107] The fragments surviving prove that the argument of the story was about the madness of Aias and what followed it up to the moment of his suicide; then there seems to be a part on the prevention of the burial, and somebody speaks of Aias' great deeds (fr. 15 W) and how soon all these were forgotten (fr. 16 W). Ennius' *Aiax* (frs. 10-3 Jocelyn) revolved around the death of the hero.[108]

However condensed the judgment was in Roman drama, it is interesting that both Roman poets present Aias speaking of his valour and against Odysseus' pretended madness. The lack of fragments representing that part of the Aischylean drama and the gap we are left with as to what Aias said to defend himself, make the fragments of Pacuvius and Accius worthy of some study.

[107] Sophokles' *Aias* was occasionally mentioned as *Mastigophoros* (cf. *argumentum* S. *Aj.*; Athenaios 7.277c), and this is probably where Livius Andronicus turned for inspiration.

[108] Jocelyn (1967: 177).

The Achilleus tragedies

There are three plays on Achilleus, the *Myrmidones*, the *Nereides* and the *Phryges* or *Hektoros Lytra*, that have often been grouped in that order as a trilogy,[1] though no ancient authority attests to this. The plays revolved around the story of Achilleus as found in the latter part of the *Iliad*. The *Myrmidones* told the story of the rejection of the embassy by Achilleus and the subsequent death of Patroklos in battle. The *Nereides* presented the return of Achilleus to the battlefield with his newly acquired weapons and the death of Hektor, and the *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra* narrated the arrival of Priamos at the Achaean camp and the ransoming of his son's corpse.

Although the evidence for the existence of this trilogy is not more than in other cases, the trilogy is generally considered more plausible than others, as the number of the researchers accepting it suggests. The proposed trilogic connection will be adopted in the current study, with all relevant reservations, since there is no secure testimony whatsoever verifying the existence of such a trilogy other than the suggested causal sequence between the plays.

These three plays, which have been named the *Achilleis*,[2] carry a special significance for several reasons within the surviving corpus of Aischylos. Firstly, because there are more

[1] Croiset (1894: 151); Laurent (1898: 185); Schadewaldt (1936: 25); Séchan (1926: 114); Mette (1959: 70); Mette (1963: 112); Barabino (1956: 57); Massei (1969 : 159); Trendall and Webster (1971: 54); Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 10); Gantz (1980b: 145); D'Antó (1980: 183); Ferrari (1982: 21); Döhle (1983: 161); Garzya (1991: 47); Moreau (1996: 6); Sommerstein (1996: 338); Michelakis (2002: 22).

[2] The title has no ancient authority but is useful shorthand.

fragments and *testimonia* surviving than in other cases of lost Aischylean plays, and this allows for a greater scope for reconstruction and analysis. Secondly, because this story originates from a surviving epic poem and this allows us to check to some extent the reception of a Homeric story by Aischylos. This becomes all the more important because of the striking fact that the tragedians rarely covered ground specifically Homeric.[3] This is a very unusual choice of theme and a remarkably bold one since it would allow a generic and authorial comparison for the audience. If the plays are early, as is occasionally suggested (cf. p. 99), then Aischylos might have attempted this near the beginning of his career, perhaps with youthful excitement.

It may be of course that it was precisely the opportunity to tell the famous epic story in a new way that appealed to Aischylos. Besides, the chronological and sociological gap between the Homeric era and fifth-century Athens would have allowed, or even called for, an adaptation of the story. What is more, the transformation from third-person, epic narrative to dramatic performance would itself call for changes.

It will emerge that, while keeping to the same story line and preserving the same roles for the same characters, Aischylos managed to create a different story by making certain adjustments of remarkable boldness: for example, he changes completely the ambiance of the embassy by remodelling the relationships between Achilleus and the ambassadors and, thereby, between Achilleus and the army. Moreover, he redefines the relationship

[3] For Sophokles there is one title attested deriving from the story of the *Iliad*: the *Phryges* (cf. pp. 151-2). No title related to the story of the *Iliad* is attested for Euripides. For other poets and possibilities, see p. 152.

between the epic Achilleus and his best friend as one of lovers. It will be seen that changes of this kind, apart from adding a diverse colour to the story, have another important function: they bring the story closer to the experience of fifth-century Athens.

A third reason for the importance of this trilogy is that there is the possibility that these plays are among the first plays of Aischylos and this would make them informative for the first years of his career.[4] If so, then as early as the very beginning of the fifth century Aischylos worked on themes that he subsequently revisited in his corpus, such as the presentation of oriental enemies, pity towards the enemy, loss and pain, resolution of enmity, the parent-child relationship. He also developed techniques like silence and suspense which later become part of his stock in trade.

[4] See Gantz (1980b: 146); Croiset (1894: 153; 165); Ferrari (1982: 30); Sommerstein (1996: 339) for the view that the plays were early and performed with two actors only.

The *Myrmidones*

Fragments and testimonia

There are more fragments surviving from the *Myrmidones* (*TrGF* iii frs. 131-42) than from any other lost tragedy of Aischylos and several ancient *testimonia* for certain aspects of this play.[5] The plot of the *Myrmidones* has been repeatedly reconstructed and the broad plot outline can be regarded as firmly established, even if matters of detail remain contentious.[6] The play probably started with the words of the chorus of Myrmidons (schol. Ar. *Ra.* 992: πρὸς τὸν Αἰσχύλον ὁ χορὸς ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτοῦ· ἔστι δὲ ἀρχὴ αὕτη Μυρμιδόνων Αἰσχύλου.)

TrGF iii fr. 131

τάδε μὲν λεύσσεις, φαίδιμ' Ἀχιλλεῦ,
δοριλ̣υμάντους Δαναῶν μόχθους,
οὓς σὺ π̣ροπιν̣ εἴσω
κλισία̣ς
οὔνε̲[
δηΐ̣ .[
ηρ .[
τον̲[

[5] The fragments are presented in the order that serves our argument.

[6] For reconstructions of the argument, see Radt (1985: 240); Schadewaldt (1936: 45-7) ; Mette (1963: 112-8); Croiset (1894: 151-63); Gantz (1980b: 145-6); Séchan (1926: 115); Garzya (1991: 51-53); Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 11); Döhle (1983: 164-5); Moreau (1996: 7); Taplin (1972: 69-73); Sommerstein (1996: 339-42); Michelakis (2002: 23).

The drama plunges us at the outset in *medias res*. Apparently, the members of the chorus enter in the *parodos* and find Achilleus sitting in his hut (*TrGF* iii fr. 131. 3-4).[7] In *TrGF* iii fr. 131 the chorus makes clear the critical phase that the war has reached and the absence of Achilleus from the Achaean fighting. Achilleus has withdrawn from the battle and remains in his hut, watching but not taking any action. The chorus addresses the hero with respect (cf. l. 1: φαίδιμ' Ἀχιλλεῦ) and its members are evidently friendly to the hero, as a chorus of his compatriots would naturally be. A possibility could be that the chorus was formed by the personal guard of Achilleus, a group that was not to follow Patroklos to battle later.[8]

The silence of Achilleus

A reference in Aristophanes (*Ra.* 911-13) has led to suggestions that the opening scene of this play presented Achilleus sitting silent and veiled on stage.[9]

> πρώτιστα μὲν γὰρ ἕνα τιν' ἂν καθεῖσεν ἐγκαλύψας,
> Ἀχιλλέα τιν' ἢ Νιόβην, τὸ πρόσωπον οὐχὶ δεικνύς,
> πρόσχημα τῆς τραγῳδίας, γρύζοντας οὐδὲ τουτί.

The scholia on these lines (schol. Ar. *Ra.* 911-13) are more informative:

---

[7] Taplin (1972: 67); Garzya (1991: 51) speak of an *ekkyklema* used. This is not implausible but the action could alternatively have taken place in front of the tent and the audience would have to believe what the actors said.

[8] The example of the *Agamemnon* suggests as an alternative a chorus of old men, but there the old men have been excluded from the campaign and we encounter them in their home city. It would be odd to find old men in a plot set in a military camp.

[9] For more, see Taplin (1972: 59; 63; 69ff.); Ferrari (1982: 24-6); Garzya (1991: 49); Di Benedetto (1967: 374). Aélion (1983-4: 35) notes the Homeric silences as the model for the ones found in Aischylos.

> ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς δὲ καθήμενός ἐστι καὶ οὐκ ἀποκρινόμενος παρ' Αἰσχύλῳ ἐν δράματι ἐπιγραφομένῳ Φρυξὶν ἢ Ἕκτορος λύτροις·; εἰκὸς τὸν ἐν τοῖς Φρυξὶν Ἀχιλλέα ἢ Ἕκτορος λύτροις. ἢ τὸν ἐν Μυρμιδόσιν, ὃς μέχρι τριῶν ἡμερῶν οὐδὲν φθέγγεται.

Apart from any other effects, the silence of the hero at this point has the dramatic advantage of allowing the chorus to give to the *parodos* a narrative dimension by speaking of the prehistory of the war and of the *menis* of the hero, as in *Agamemnon* 40-82, and to explain how things reached this point where Achilleus remains in his tent refusing to help the Achaeans.

The silence of Achilleus is worth closer inspection. It is probable that the reference to the silence of Achilleus in Aristophanes (*Ra.* 911-3) mainly, or exclusively, reflects his silence in the *Myrmidones*[10] rather than (as has also been suggested) a combination of his silence in the *Myrmidones* and the *Phryges*.[11] We are told by Aristophanes that Achilleus broke his silence in Aischylos with war-like words (*Ra.* 924-6, especially ll. 924-6: ῥήματ' ἂν βόεια δώδεκ' εἶπεν, / ὀφρῦς ἔχοντα καὶ λόφους, δεῖν' ἄττα μορμορωπά, / ἄγνωτα τοῖς θεωμένοις) and these are unlikely to have come from the *Phryges* and the mourning context suspected for the play (cf. p. 141).

The way Aristophanes puts it implies that the silence of Achilleus was first broken with this bombastic and opaque war vocabulary. However, the discovery of *TrGF* iii fr.

[10] Taplin (1972: 63).

[11] Ferrari (1982: 25).

**132b which is assigned to this play by modern researchers,[12] has changed the picture. The fragment may come from the *Myrmidones*, firstly, because of the external evidence: the Florentina papyrus which includes the fragment was written in the same hand as P. Oxy. 2163.[13] Secondly, it can be related to the play because of the internal evidence that points to similarities to Aischylean practices. *TrGF* iii fr. **132b presents the breaking of a long silence by Achilleus, in the context of an embassy, in a way that points to the breaking of significant Aischylean silences. *TrGF* iii fr. **132b contains all the elements that Taplin classifies as making a silence significant and thus a so-called 'Aischylean silence' rather than a non-significant silence in Aischylos.[14] The lines are reminiscent of the queen's breaking of her silence after the messenger's terrible news in the *Persai* (*Pers.* 290-1). In both cases the character stresses the fact that for a while now he/she has been silent. If Achilleus breaks his silence to speak to Phoinix and stresses this, it is doubtful if he would have spoken before this scene.

Therefore, in our opinion, it is likely that the fragment comes from the *Myrmidones*. It is less probable that there was another play that presented the embassy to the hero, included a silence of the sort attested for Aischylos, and terminated this silence in such an Aischylean way.

---

[12] Mette (1959: 77); Benedetto (1967: 373); Taplin (1972: 71-2); Garzya (1991: 42-3); Sommerstein (1996: 339); Michelakis (2002: 23) accept the assignment.

[13] P. Oxy 2163 includes fragments assigned to this play (*TrGF* iii fr. 131 and *TrGF* iii frs. **132a.1-9). See the discussion in p. 107. See Radt (1985: 244), for more information on the papyrus that includes the fragment.

[14] Taplin (1972: 57-8; 96); Aélion (1983-4: 37).

TrGF iii fr. **132b:

<ΦΟΙ.>

] . [

]τι . α . ωγε . | . . . [

] . ἐπῳδὴν |ο|ὐκ ἔχω σο[

]πεσεισαπ|α|σαν ἡνίαν [

] . . δ' Ἀχιλλεῦ |π|ρᾶσσ' ὅπῃ [5

<ΑΧ.>

Φοῖ]νιξ γεραιέ, τῶν | ἐμῶν φρε[νῶν

πολ]λῶν ἀκούων |δ|υστόμων λ[

πάλ]αι σιωπῶ κοὐδ|εν [.]στ . μ[

] ἀντέλεξα. σὲ δε . | [. .]αξιωτ[

In this fragment, Achilleus speaks to Phoinix with respect and mild words. It is, therefore, necessary to determine to whom he addresses the kind of words that Aristophanes mentions.[15] The key to the question could be the degree of freedom that Aristophanes allowed himself. The lines of Aristophanes referring to the war vocabulary of Aischylos deserve to be read with more scepticism than they usually are. It should always be taken into account, when we are trying to gather information for lost plays, that the prism of comedy is often a distorting one, as comedy is allowed to exaggerate or to misplace elements for the sake of humour.[16] Aristophanes wrote the play not as a literary historian but as a comic poet. His comic purpose required not a precisely engineered depiction of the work of Euripides or Aischylos but a caricature. It is possible that Aristophanes

[15] The solution offered by Taplin (1972: 73) that Achilleus utters these incoherent words in a scene before he actually breaks his silence, is not impossible; but his suggestion that with these incoherent words Achilleus sent Patroklos to battle is implausible. Phoinix would have no urgent reason to try and persuade Achilleus to join the battle, if Achilleus had already sent Patroklos to battle and so aided the Achaean army.

[16] See p. 17.

exaggerated the war-like nature and the incoherence of the words of Achilleus, perhaps based on the whole corpus of Aischylos and the warlike quality of the story of the *Myrmidones*. Another possibility is that Aristophanes artificially narrows the interval between Achilleus' silence and the utterance of the wild words. The comedian could also be exaggerating how incomprehensible all this was to the audience. Was it perhaps a generalised reference to the neologisms often inserted by Aischylos? This is not improbable. *TrGF* iii fr. 134 is proof of these neologisms:

> †ἀπὸ δ' αὖτε† ξουθὸς ἱππαλεκτρυὼν
> στάζει †κηρόθεν τῶν† φαρμάκων πολὺς πόνος

Aristophanes makes fun of this passage (cf. *Ra.* 931-2: ἤδη ποτ' ἐν μακρῷ χρόνῳ νυκτὸς διηγρύπνησα / τὸν ξουθὸν ἱππαλεκτρυόνα ζητῶν τίς ἐστιν ὄρνις).

TrGF iii **fr. 132b proves the close relationship of Phoinix and Achilleus (cf. l. 5: Ἀχιλλεῦ; l. 6: Φοῖ]νιξ γεραιέ; l. 9: σὲ δε . | [. .]αξιωτ[), implies the long silence of the hero that ends at this point (cf. ll. 8-9: πάλ]αι σιωπῶ κοὐδ|εν [.]στ . μ[/] ἀντέλεξα), and clearly refers to harsh words that Achilleus had heard (cf. l. 7: πολ]λῶν ἀκούων |δ|υστόμων λ[). *TrGF* iii fr. **132b, probably coming from the play of Aischylos *Myrmidones*, opens the way for harsh words that Achilleus had already heard before speaking to Phoinix. Who spoke these harsh words? We should at this point examine another fragment.

TrGF iii fr. 132:

> Φθιῶτ' Ἀχιλλεῦ, τί ποτ' ἀνδροδάικτον ἀκούων,
> ἰή, κόπον οὐ πελάθεις ἐπ' ἀρωγάν;

In *TrGF* iii fr. 132 there are again clear references to the critical situation of the Achaeans and the apathy of Achilleus. *TrGF* iii fr. 132 (Ar. *Ra.* 1264-5) is lyric (iambic tetrameters) and, according to a *testimonium* (schol. Ar. *Ra.* 1264), these are the words of the ambassadors: πρὸς Ἀχιλλέα Αἰσχύλος πεποίηκεν τοῦτο ἀπὸ τῶν πρέσβεων.

The ambassador could sing these lyric and emotional lines as part of a lamenting song related to the suffering of the Achaeans and the refusal of Achilleus to help them, perhaps in a sort of lyric dialogue with the chorus in iambics (cf. A. *Pers.* 1039-66: chorus-Xerxes). Lyric iambics are common in drama and in Aischylos in particular.[17] The cry ἰή (*TrGF* iii fr. 132.2) could express, among other things, woe.[18] The fragment is sung by someone in toil and distress, when addressing Achilleus. It is difficult to see how these could be the words of the same ambassador who uses the harsh language that Achilleus complains of in other fragments. The only ambassador who can address these melancholic words to Achilleus is Phoinix.

There have been suggestions, however, that this scholion should not be read so literally and that *TrGF* iii fr. 132 should be assigned to the chorus of Myrmidons.[19] It is not impossible that the scholion is wrong; sometimes scholia are. There is one obstacle, however, with assigning this fragment to a chorus of Myrmidons: the fact that Achilleus is here addressed as Φθιῶτ' Ἀχιλλεῦ (cf. l. 1). The problem with the address is the

[17] Raven (1962: 41-2); West (1982: 99); Dain (1965: 132-6); Thomson (1961: 88).

[18] Cf. A. *Hik.* 115, *Pers.* 1004; 1075-6.

[19] Taplin (1972: 69, n. 41) believes that the lines are spoken by the chorus and not the ambassadors; Michelakis (2002: 23).

ethnic adjective used. Though we cannot rule out the possibility that a chorus from Phthia could address Achilleus in this way in order to inform the audience on the identity of the hero, it would be more suited in the mouth of a non-Phthiot. Though certainty is impossible, on balance a lyric exchange between Phoinix, who was not originally from Phthia, but from Ormenium, and the chorus of Myrmidons could perhaps clarify things.

*The harsh words and the ** fragments*

To retrieve the harsh words that Achilleus complains of, we have the tentative assignment of a number of fragments to the play, which should be examined. *TrGF* iii fr. **132a consists of nine individual fragments (1-9), of which most are too fragmentary to help us. *TrGF* iii frs. **132a.4.col.I and **132a.8 are in part legible. There is good external evidence for the assignment: the fragments are attested in P. Oxy. 2163 frs. 2-9, as is *TrGF* iii fr. 131 (P. Oxy. 2163 fr. 1), which is additionally assigned to the play by other sources.[20] Moreover, there is internal evidence, as well: Achilleus is addressed (*TrGF* iii **fr. 132a.8.4) and the fragments discuss betrayal (*TrGF* iii **fr. 132a.8.5; *TrGF* iii fr. **132a.4. col.I.2). This would be in line with the content of the Aischylean play.

TrGF iii fr. **132a.4.col. I

]ν . [.]φήσομεν
]ενων κακανδρίαι
] .α .αις ἄτερ δίκης
]αινεσω
]. .ησχεας[5

[20] The fragments are discussed as part of the play by Garzya (1991: 41-2); Taplin (1972: 69), who considers *TrGF* iii **fr. 132a.8 to be the words of the chorus; Sommerstein (1996: 339-40).

] . μερος

]α

]ην[

Fr. **132a.8

]σδ' ἀνόνητον

] διαφθορᾶς

].ασσεις

].ν ἄναξ Ἀχιλλεῦ

]λλανα μὴ προδῷς σ[5

]φιστονως

ζε]ύγνυται μελα[

]ν φράσαι .ελ[

]νεδ.[

]ορτ.[

The two passages from *TrGF* iii fr. **132a are addressed to Achilleus in a way that shows a distance between the speaker and the hero (cf. *TrGF* iii fr. **132a.8.4: ἄναξ Ἀχιλλεῦ). This 'king Achilleus' is radically different from the 'Achilleus' that we find in Phoinix's speech or in the chorus' words (fr. **132b.5 and 131.1 respectively) and should perhaps direct us to an ambassador who was not as close to the hero as the old man and the chorus were. The content of the passages points to treason on several occasions (cf. *TrGF* iii fr. **132a.8.5: μὴ προδῷς; fr. **132.a.4.col. I.2: κακανδρίαι) and could imply a trial or the lack of one, perhaps related to accusations for treason, or to an injustice committed (cf. *TrGF* iii fr. **132.a.4.col.I.3: ἄτερ δίκης). The fragments imply a collision. It is difficult to see another context for these fragments than Achilleus' *menis*. Having lost the greater part of the *Myrmidones*, the only attested play to have

securely presented the *menis*, these fragments can help us to recover the atmosphere of the play, if rightly assigned to the play.

The efforts to retrieve parts of the *Myrmidones* do not stop here. Other *adespota* fragments have been suggested for the play, albeit with less evidence. *TrGF* iii fr. **132c is tentatively assigned to the play by several modern researchers.[21] This assignment is, however, rejected by others, who suggest that other minor tragedians have written plays on Achilleus (cf. p. 151), and that the fragment could be part of one of those plays.[22] Although there is no evidence that the plays of the above mentioned poets dealt with the rejection of the embassy and antiquity showed a characteristic preference for preserving plays of the three great tragedians more than of the rest, these doubts should be kept in mind. As a result, there is no secure evidence for this assignment but we should, nevertheless, examine the fragment. *TrGF* iii fr. **132c appears to be part of a speech where Achilleus defends himself against treason accusations:

<AX.>
λεύσουσι τοὐμὸν σῶμα· μὴ δόκει ποτὲ
πέτρ[ο]ις καταξανθέντα Πηλέως γόνον
. . .]. .[.] . (.)ησειν Τρωϊκὴν ἀνὰ χθόνα
. .]ημένοισι Τρωσὶ τὴν ἄ[ν]ευ δορὸς
. . .]. γένοιτ ἂν εὐπετεστερ. . λεχους

[21] The fragment was found in P.S.I. 1211 and is included in the edition of Radt (1985: 244-5). See, also, Schadewaldt (1936: 26-7); Mette (1959: 78-80); Gantz (1980b: 145, n. 49); Rea (1971: 93-4); Snell (1964: 2); Garzya (1991: 43); Diggle (1998: 18-9); Michelakis (2002: 24).

[22] Lloyd-Jones (1963: 591) and (1966: 13); Page (1950: 136-40); Taplin (1972: 74). For more on the question of the authorship of *TrGF* iii fr. **132c and all the relevant bibliography, see Radt (1985: 244-5).

. . .] τοῦτο δή, βροτοῖσιν ἰατρὸν πόνων·
. . . .]ιδ' Ἀχαιῶν χεῖρ' ἐφορμήσω δορὶ
. . .]ωσαν ὀργῇ ποιμένος κακοῦ διαὶ
. . . .]περ εἷς ὤν, ὡς λέγουσι σύμμαχοι
. . . . .]ν τοσαύτην ἔκτισ' οὐ παρὼν μάχῃ
. . . . .]μ' ἐγὼ τὰ πάντ' Ἀχαιϊκῷ στρατῷ
. . . . .].' ἀφεῖναι τοὔπος οὐκ αἰδώς μ' ἔχει
. . . . . .] τοιούτ[ο]υς εὐγενεστέρους ἐμοῦ
. . . . . .]ν . . .οι καὶ στρατοῦ τὰ βέλτατα·
. . . . . .]. .[. .]. . ὑμὰς εἷς ἀνὴρ ἠ[ι]κίζετο
. . . . . .].αράσσων καὶ πολυσκεδεῖς συθεὶς
. . . . . .]α τεύχ[η π]ερὶ νέοις βραχ[ίο]σιν
. . . . . .].ευ.[. .] δε †πανθίμων† στρατὸν
]. . .[. .]ων εὐμαρῶς ἐτρ[έ]ψατο·
]. .[.].δ. .ς προδοσίαν. . .[.] μεμοι·
].[. ἄ]νδρα τόνδ' α. . .[. . .] θανεῖν·
]. .ᾱ[ca.13 ll.] . .[. .]ν
]οισε[. .]. ἰδουσιν. .οστ[.]μ . ν
].ικα. . νηστρ[.]τ. .[
] τόνδ' ἀπολλυ. . .[. .]. . .ν
]ας εἶπον οὐ ψευδῆ λέγων
]οι τόνδ' ἀποφθερεῖ στρατὸν
]ηνισως ὁρᾶν πάρα·
]. (.)κατ. . . .ουμένην
]φανῶς κατήγορος
]. . ἐλε[ύ]θερον λέγεις
]. . . εὐτυχεστερα
].α. . οὐδεὶς φρονεῖ
ο]ὐδαμῶς πρέπει τόδε
]. .αι διαλ[λα]γαὶ
]υχω μειλί[γ]ματι

TrGF iii fr. **132c could give us a view of what the harsh words that Achilleus had complained of hearing were about. His perspective is very similar to what we have in *TrGF* iii fr. **132a and this suggests that they could come from the same, or a similar, play. If not from the *Myrmidones*, but from another unidentified play on the same story, these fragments could be a guide to what the Aischylean Achilleus might have also said and this speech is, moreover, as will be later discussed, in compliance with what an Athenian general might have said under the same circumstances. Achilleus refers to the possibility of stoning as punishment (ll. 1-2),[23] to the anger of a bad leader of the army (l. 8), to allies (l. 9), to his past contribution to the Achaean cause (ll. 10-24), to treason (l. 20), to honesty (l. 26) and to the existence of an accuser (l. 30).

Achilleus seems to consider the possibility of death as the doctor of all pains (l. 6), and thus disregards the threat of stoning and the impact it can have on his decision whether to fight or not. Perhaps he considers death a salvation from the dishonour that he now endures. Or he could simply be dismissing death as no evil but the end to mortal suffering. It must be noted that whereas Achilleus disregards the stoning possibility, he is very concerned about the accusation and tries to clear his name; the hero states once more that what made him resign from battle was Agamemnon's behaviour, and then reflects on what he had offered to the army and how he had saved them from a mighty opponent (ll.

[23] It is not certain that the Achaeans decided or threatened him with stoning. The fragment can only attest that this was a thought of Achilleus, evidently not improbable under the circumstances. See Michelakis (2002: 24), for the view that there was a threat actually spoken by the Achaeans.

11-28), a kind of *captatio benevolentiae*,[24] or a forceful rejection of any suggestion of disloyalty, a justification of his stands. The insult is mostly the accusation of treason and not this supposed threat, which Achilleus himself treats as of minor importance. To better understand this behaviour of Achilleus, one must focus on the relationship between Achilleus and the army which seems to have been determined differently than in the Homeric telling of the story. Before that, nonetheless, we should have a look at suggestions concerning the identity of the ambassadors.

The identity of the ambassadors

In breaking his silence, Achilleus answers not only to Phoinix but also to accusations expressed by an ambassador whose speech preceded that of Phoinix and who probably left the stage without getting any reply. If we turn for a minute to the *Iliad*, we see that Achilleus states his decision to sail home immediately after the speech of Odysseus (*Il.* 9.428-9), Phoinix approaches Achilleus in an appeasing way, accepting his offer to sail with him and then indirectly bringing the focus back to where Odysseus left it: the need to return to battle. He speaks firstly of honour and then of pity and makes an appeal to self-interest, using the example of Meleagros, who rejected all the offers for honours and gifts, but finally yielded to his wife's request. Achilleus declares that he will only fight if the Trojans threaten those he cherishes the most, the Myrmidons (*Il.* 9.650-3).

[24] Sommerstein (1996: 340) believes that Achilleus is boasting in *TrGF* iii **132c.7-14 and that the hero is egotistical in Aischylos. This, however, need not be more than a rhetorical way to prove his value to those who doubted him (cf. *Il.* 9.321-32).

Phoinix is presented in the *Iliad* as being one of Achilleus' followers, and this would probably be the case in the *Myrmidones* (cf. *TrGF* iii fr. **132b). In the *Iliad* the ambassadors have mutually complementary roles, and it is very probable that in this play another ambassador before Phoinix made a more logical and more distant approach to Achilleus to persuade him to fight then Phoinix made a more immediate approach and a more sentimental one. There is a gradual movement in the *Iliad* in three steps (ambassadors-Phoinix-Patroklos) and this might have been repeated in this play.

Who would the ambassador in the *Myrmidones* be? The suggestions are usually two, both of them tentative. The first is the herald Talthybios, accompanied by Eurybates, and the second is Odysseus. The heralds Talthybios and Eurybates are mentioned as summoning Achilleus to battle without speaking in a rather problematic scholion on silences in tragedy (schol. A. *Pr.* 441). This has been the basis for researchers to add them as mute characters in the *Myrmidones*.[25] The first problem, if we consider the scholion to refer to the play, is that to send a herald as an ambassador, and not another king as in the *Iliad*, would be to show contempt to Achilleus. Heralds both in tragedy and in epic are sent to carry out routine tasks and never to convey instructions to a king. Moreover, the scholion notes that the heralds did not speak and this cannot be accommodated with the harsh words that Achilleus mentions that he has heard from the

[25] Before the article by Herington (1972: 202), which shed doubts on the credibility of the scholion, one could often find the heralds in reconstructions of the *Myrmidones*: e.g. Croiset (1894: 156); Di Benedetto (1967: 379); Taplin (1972: 64-5). See also pp. 158-60, for suggestions for Talthybios' presence based on iconographical indications.

ambassadors before he decides to speak to Phoinix (cf. *TrGF* iii fr. **132b.7).[26] In conclusion, one could say that the reliability of a scholion so brief and unspecific should not be accepted uncritically. It is not a safe basis for reconstructing the play, and perhaps it should be altogether disregarded.

Another possibility is that Odysseus would be the first ambassador.[27] In the *Iliad* Odysseus (*Il.* 9.225-306) and Phoinix (*Il.* 9.434-605) are the main speakers, and Aias' role is rather small (*Il.* 9.624-42). Odysseus is often found in tragedy as an intermediary between kings, as with the Aischylean *Philoktetes* (cf. pp. 221-3). There are further possibilities for the identity of the first ambassador, but they do not seem likely. Such is the case of Diomedes, who is mostly presented as accompanying Odysseus in different tasks in epic stories, rather than actually taking the lead. Antilochos is found as an ambassador to Achilleus in Roman tragedy (cf. p. 153); his selection as ambassador would make sense in view of his relationship with Achilleus both in the *Iliad* and in the *Aithiopis*, but he cannot serve as the ambassador needed in our case because, like Phoinix, he is close to Achilleus and would not have spoken to him in the distant and harsh way that Achilleus complains of in the fragment (*TrGF* iii fr. **132b.7).

[26] An only faint possibility is that the heralds performed a symbolic act with which they summoned Achilleus to battle without saying a word. This symbolic act could have been the return of Briseis but this would be a very perfunctory treatment of a major development; the return of the girl is a pivotal moment that signals the end of the dispute after the death of Patroklos.

[27] For this view, see Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 12); Döhle (1983: 165); Michelakis (2002: 31).

The relationship between Achilleus and the army

From the minute that the embassy arrives on the Aischylean stage it is made evident that the members of the audience that are familiar with Homer are in for a surprise; Achilleus does not accept the embassy in the same friendly way as in the *Iliad* (cf. *Il.* 9.202-21; 308; 644), where he calls them *philtatoi* (*Il.* 9.197-8), showing his respect to their faces and their mission as well. In a distinctly different way, the immobility and the silence of Achilleus in the *Myrmidones*, and the fact that he does not even reveal his face to them, are indicative of disrespect towards the embassy.[28] This is all the more intensified by the fact that, although he clearly disrespects the other ambassador, he explains to Phoinix that he does respect him, thus signalling their special relationship. But who do these ambassadors represent and why are they rejected by Achilleus? The ambassador in Aischylos represents the army, in contrast to the *Iliad*, where the ambassadors represent Agamemnon. In Aischylos the embassy seems to adopt the view that Achilleus could actually be a traitor, and the accusation that they make seems to come from the Greeks collectively. This means that the army is harsher towards Achilleus, and that he is more distant from them, than in the *Iliad*. This does not mean that he has any hostility towards the army in the *Myrmidones*; besides, he notes the existence of a *kakos poimen*, apparently Agamemnon (*TrGF* iii fr. **132c.8).

The attitude of the embassy seems to be different from that of the Iliadic one. Achilleus' silence is a sign of contempt, perhaps resulting from their disrespect of him. The

[28] Sommerstein (1996: 340) sees Achilleus to be contemptuous to the Achaean leaders. Michelakis (2002: 32) suggests that the immobility of Achilleus is his power in this situation, his superiority against those who insulted him.

embassy in the *Iliad* says nothing that Achilleus could characterise as harsh words (cf. *TrGF* iii fr. **132b), apart from saying that the hero is cruel hearted (*Il.* 9.630; 632; 636) and certainly there are no threats expressed. The ambassador with the harsh language is radically different from the Homeric Odysseus or Aias. In the *Iliad* they greet Achilleus in a very friendly way (cf. *Il.* 641-2), and they never speak of treason and punishment in case he does not comply, but simply of the honour that he will gain by helping them (*Il.* 9.302-3). While the general feeling there is that the embassy pleads with Achilleus for his help, in the *Myrmidones* it sounds as if they demand it and as if it was his obligation to fight for them. In the play, the Achaeans do not beg for the Iliadic Achilleus' help, they demand the services of an Athenian Achilleus. Finally, the first ambassador abandons the effort to elicit a response from Achilleus, possibly in the way that Klytaimnestra does in the *Agamemnon* in the scene with Kassandra (cf. *A.* 1069).

Sommerstein argues against the presence of an embassy in the play, mainly because he accepts the view that it was performed with only two actors.[29] This would be to ignore, however, the scholion (schol. Ar. *Ra.* 1264) that points to an embassy.[30] Rejecting the embassy would leave us without any obviours explanation for the harsh words that Achilleus complains of, and therefore, would have deprived us of the building up of tension and of the gradual move of Achilleus, because of his three encounters, from total refusal of the Achaeans to his total compliance to Patroklos. Besides, if the play does

[29] Sommerstein (1996: 339; 342). See also p. 99, n. 4.

[30] The scholion suggests more than one ambassador, but we believe that it actually refers to one of them, Phoinix. See pp. 105-7.

precede the introduction of the third actor, it is not inconceivable that an embassy existed anyway.

Achilleus, an Athenian general

There is no doubt that epic heroes were allowed and expected to do anything to protect their personal honour, and epic society accepted their right to do so.[31] The principal claims of the Homeric man were the attainment of success and fame and the avoidance of failure and disgrace.[32] *Time* was the focal point of Homeric morality and this was especially related to military valour.[33] In the *Iliad* Agamemnon is dishonoured when he is left without his *geras*, Chryseis, and commits the injustice on Achilleus. Achilleus is dishonoured when Agamemnon deprives him of his *geras*, Briseis, and allows the Trojans to slaughter the Achaeans for days. Hektor places reputation above life, and allows his duty to his own honour to override his commitment to his wife, son and parents. Aias commits suicide when he is deprived of the ultimate prize and the highest honour for any warrior, Achilleus' weapons. Heroic retaliation is the only choice for an individual who is disgraced; even to sacrifice one's life for his *time* is understandable in

[31] See discussions in Yamagata (1994: 121-44); Finley (1954: 108-41); Adkins (1960: 30-60); Silk (1987: 29).

[32] Adkins (1960: 57).

[33] Yamagata (1994: 129).

the sphere of Homeric morality.[34] Nonetheless, epic heroes are also expected to show a concern for their *laos*.[35]

Honour still matters enormously in fifth-century society,[36] but going to the extreme to protect one's personal honour, especially when to do so the individual endangers the collective, was no longer acceptable in Athens. The moral as well as political authority was now the state and individuals have obligations towards it.[37] For example, one of the civic obligations greatly respected in Athens was military service that was considered obligatory upon all citizens in good health and of military age.[38] Athenians served in all ranks of the Athenian army, from soldier to general, and the higher one was ranked, the more responsibilities he carried, and the harsher the punishment was if one abandoned his responsibilities.

In the *Myrmidones*, things are put by Aischylos in a different perspective than the one we find in the *Iliad* as far as the general Achilleus is concerned (his disrespectful silence and the harsh words that he listens to point to this). In Aischylos the clash is not one between one's personal honour and the conditional duty to a greater king, but between an excessive insistence on personal honour and the compelling fifth-century obligation of a

[34] Yamagata (1994: 134; 142-4).

[35] See Haubold (2000: 17-46), for a discussion on the relationship between an epic leader and the *laos*, his responsibilities towards his people and the consequences if he fails them.

[36] Dover (1974: 226-36) discusses the Athenian desire for honour and (*ibid.*: 236-42) discusses possible causes and effects of shame of individuals in Athens, which are close to the epic ones.

[37] Dover (1974: 301-9).

[38] Hansen (1991: 100).

general to the collective.[39] The fragments point to an Athenian handling of the crisis of the *Iliad*. There are several cases in tragedy where the *polis* comes as a factor into the mythical stories to create new ethical collisions; the clash of other claims, of another era or another society, with those of the *polis*.[40] In our case, the Homeric morality of a king meets the fifth-century morality of an organized *laos* who has the power and the means to impeach the king/general.

The Athenians had a history of being harsh with their generals when it was felt that they did not do the best they could for the collective, and their punishment was often directed even to generals who had been successful and important in the past. Roberts suggests that generals in Athens ran a greater risk of being sentenced to death than dying on the battlefield, if accused of mismanaging their offices or for incompetence.[41] Michelakis sees the clash in Aischylos as related to fifth-century politics and comparable to the practice of ostracism, where the collective moves against a powerful individual.[42] He who is potentially dangerous for the state is removed from it by a secret procedure. The comparison is not without merit; but it should be noted that there is another Athenian institution that can be related to the case as presented in Aischylos: the *eisangelia*.

The *eisangelia* was a process used for political purposes and consisted of a direct accusation in front of 500 judges. Hansen notes that the *eisangelia* was in use from 493

[39] See discussion in Michelakis (2002: 22-4).

[40] White (2002: 135-9).

[41] Roberts (1982: 20; 162).

[42] Michelakis (2002: 25; 30).

to 324 B.C.[43] It occasionally dealt with treason and if so, the case was tried at the assembly;[44] there are hundreds of such cases attested, often resulting in death sentences.[45] This was probably what would happen in the case of Aischylos' *Palamedes*, where the hero is accused for treason and brought to trial. Palamedes uses his former accomplishments to achieve the *captatio banevolentiae* of the judges (cf. pp. 251-4).

Alternatives to eisangelia

It is not clear on the surviving evidence whether there would be a trial in the case of Achilleus or whether the possibility of the punishment which the hero finds insulting has different origins. There is a reference to the lack of a trial or the lack of justice (cf. *TrGF* iii fr. **132a.4.col.I.3), which could be combined with the stoning option (cf. *TrGF* iii fr. **132c.1-2). One must note that it is not necessary to assume that the ambassador ever made a specific threat of stoning against the hero. Achilleus could bring up the possibility of the stoning himself as a possible impulsive reaction of the mob.

Stoning, although often referred to in tragedy,[46] was not something common in Athenian reality and certainly had no place in legal procedures.[47] The most significant example of a stoning for political reasons in the early fifth century B.C., which is repeated in several sources, is that of Lykides or Kyrsilos (both names are attested for the same character).

[43] Hansen (1975: 51).

[44] Rhodes (1972: 162-71).

[45] Hansen (1975: 11). For the rise of political trials in general in Athens of the time in general, see Bauman (1990:12).

[46] There are threats of stoning in A. *A.* 1615-6; *Th.* 199; S. *Ant.* 36; E. *Or.* 442; E. *Ion* 1222-6.

[47] Cantarella (1991: 368, n. 10). For more bibliography, see Michelakis (2002: 24), who considers stoning to be a spontaneous action and not a civic practice (cf. Plu. *Mor.* 775a).

After the battle of Salamis, Mardonios sent Mourychides to the Athenians to propose alliance. Lykides, one of the Athenian councillors, was stoned to death when he spoke in favour of the alliance with Mardonios, as he was considered by the Athenians a traitor (Hdt 9.5):

> ὃ μὲν (sc. Lykides) δὴ ταύτην τὴν γνώμην ἀπεφαίνετο, εἴτε δὴ δεδεγμένος χρήματα παρὰ Μαρδονίου, εἴτε καὶ ταῦτά οἱ ἐάνδανε· Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ αὐτίκα δεινὸν ποιησάμενοι οἵ τε ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ οἱ ἔξωθεν ὡς ἐπύθοντο, περιστάντες Λυκίδην κατέλευσαν βάλλοντες, [. . .] πυνθάνονται τὸ γινόμενον αἱ γυναῖκες τῶν Ἀθηναίων, διακελευσαμένη δὲ γυνὴ γυναικὶ καὶ παραλαβοῦσα ἐπὶ τὴν Λυκίδεω οἰκίην ἦισαν αὐτοκελέες, καὶ κατὰ μὲν ἔλευσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα κατὰ δὲ τὰ τέκνα.

The same story is found in Demosthenes (*Peri Stephanou* 204), with the name Kyrsilos, and in Lykourgos (*Kata Leokratous* 122). This historical example of stoning is related to the failure of an Athenian official to persuade his compatriots of his intentions and the stoning is, thus, the punishment for what they perceive as treason. The response of the crowd, in the case of Lykides, is not the result of a trial but a spontaneous collective reaction.

Although it would be the *eisangelia* that would have been the legal procedure to handle a crisis such as the one found in the *Myrmidones* (a general abandoning his position), a spontaneous collective stoning of the sort attested for Lykides, and repeatedly referred to in tragedy, would also be a potential menace for Achilleus in the tragic world. Besides, tragedy does not have to replicate legal details precisely. The stoning might itself be the

equivalent of *eisangelia* in an imaginary hybrid world created by the poet. Perhaps this is what Achilleus faces in the *Myrmidones*: the mob's reaction as opposed to, or replacing, the *eisangelia* procedure that he would have been entitled to as a general in Athens of the time. If no trial takes place in the play, as we suppose, then Achilleus probably puts on an informal defence, in line, however, with formal defence speeches of fifth-century Athens, to defend himself not against official accusations but to clear his name against lynching.[48] The Athenians were often faced with treason-trials in the fifth-century and at the same time have proven capable of stoning Lykides to death sometime around 480 B.C., with no evidence for treason and without ever giving him the right to a proper trial and defence- an example more in line with what happens in the tragic rather than the real world.

One effect of the location of the myth of Achilleus within power structures and legal concepts which belong more to the fifth century than to the heroic world would be to reduce the distance between the mythical world of the play and its fifth-century audience. Tragedy often situates itself within and between two different worlds: epic and contemporary.[49] Aischylos injects elements from contemporary life and reconfigures in this way the heroic world. As a result, the poet interprets the myth in a manner closer to contemporary experience.

---

[48] For persuasion and its importance in the Athenian legal system, and the *captatio benevolentiae* in cases of treason trials, see pp. 251-4.

[49] For cases of anachronisms in tragedy, see Easterling (1985: 1-10), who notes that the tragedians devised ingenious and often subtle ways of suiting the world created by the epic poets to their contemporary experience; Carey (2007: 24).

Although the epic Achilleus is implanted by Aischylos into a fifth-century democratic society, his epic manners and attitude are still preserved for him. Therefore the clash between him and the collective that has replaced Agamemnon seems to be unsolvable. This out-of-place Achilleus seems arrogant, indifferent and harsh when he is deprived of the epic right to take any action in order to pursue the preservation of his personal honour. His personal honour is no longer enough of a motive and he is more vulnerable to criticism than in Homer. However polite and respectful he might be to Phoinix, he is still a general that does not serve the collective. (This is behaviour potentially dangerous for Athens).

Aischylos initially makes his Achilleus unsympathetic, using the audience's contemporary experiences, and then elicits sympathy through his suffering, shown through another contemporary feature that he employs (homosexuality), before he concludes with his magnanimity against a fallen enemy, an enemy who resembles the barbarian enemies that the Athenians again know from real life.

The relationship of Achilleus and Patroklos

TrGF iii fr. *134a is a *testimonium* from Platon *Smp.* 180A which disagrees with Aischylos' presentation of Achilleus as the *eromenos* of Patroklos, when explaining the difference between the two roles, apparently meaning that in such a relationship Achilleus would have been the *erastes*:

> Αἰσχύλος δὲ φλυαρεῖ φάσκων Ἀχιλλέα Πατρόκλου ἐρᾶν, ὃς ἦν καλλίων οὐ μόνον Πατρόκλου ἀλλ' ἅμα καὶ τῶν ἡρώων

ἁπάντων καὶ ἔτι ἀγένειος, ἔπειτα νεώτερος πολύ, ὥς φησιν Ὅμηρος.

The element of homosexuality in this play is a remarkable innovation in the epic theme by Aischylos. There is no reference to homosexuality - explicit or implicit - in the text of the *Iliad.* It is noteworthy however that, in later eras, the relationship of the two heroes in the *Iliad* is actually read as homosexual.[50] It is uncertain whether homosexuality was left unexpressed by Homer and taken for granted by his audience, or whether it postdates the Homeric texts. Either way, later Greeks familiar with such practices, often (re)interpreted this relationship as one of lovers and not simply of friends.[51]

But which came first: the Aischylean text or the generalised assumption of the public about the relationship? In the latter case, the Athenians perceived the relationship between the two as a lovers' relationship, and Aischylos then decided to include it in the text. Would this then be the first text to do so? It is difficult to pronounce on this with confidence. One factor that could indicate that this element was first articulated in Aischylos is that Platon disagrees with the way in which the tragedian presented the roles of the *erastes* and the *eromenos* and compares the *Iliad* and Aischylos as if there was nothing in between. On what survives, we cannot go further back than the reference to Aischylos mentioning the homosexual relationship of the two heroes.

[50] For the view that homosexuality is implied in the *Iliad*, see Clarke (1978: 381-99). This seems to us implausible.

[51] See Dover (1978: 41; 53; 197-8).

This homosexual relationship of two heroes is rare in surviving drama. It is important, however, to note that the absence of homosexual love in tragedy may be the result of the accident of survival. There were probably more homosexual heroes in literature other than the Aischylean Achilleus. There is an interesting *testimonium* on this in Athenaios Athen. 13. 601a:

> οὕτω δ' ἐναγώνιος ἦν ἡ περὶ τὰ ἐρωτικὰ πραγματεία, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἡγεῖτο φορτικοὺς τοὺς ἐρωτικούς, ὥστε καὶ Αἰσχύλος μέγας ὢν ποιητὴς καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἦγον εἰς τὰ θέατρα διὰ τῶν τραγῳδιῶν τοὺς ἔρωτας, ὁ μὲν τὸν Ἀχιλλέως πρὸς Πάτροκλον, ὁ δ' ἐν τῇ Νιόβῃ τὸν τῶν παίδων· διὸ καὶ παιδεράστριάν τινες καλοῦσι τὴν τραγῳδίαν· καὶ ἐδέχοντο τὰ τοιαῦτα ἄσματα οἱ θεαταί.

Thus, we have at least two examples attested for homosexual love in tragedy: the first is apparently Aischylos' *Myrmidones* and the second is Sophokles' *Niobe*.[52] Athenaios seems to believe that the audience would not be offended by this presentation of homosexual love on stage.

To better understand the role of Patroklos in the play, we must turn to the *Iliad*. In Homer, Patroklos, who is extremely distressed (*Il.* 16.3; 20), implores Achilleus to allow him to join the battle with his divine weapons (cf. *Il.* 16.38-43). Achilleus consents, but only on the condition that Patroklos must do no more than save the ships and return (cf. *Il.* 16.95). It is likely that the play of Aischylos included a scene where a soft–hearted

[52] For a fuller discussion on the homosexual relationship in Sophokles' *Niobe*, see Hadjicosti (2006d: 131-5).

Patroklos pleaded with Achilleus to allow him to help the Achaeans in his armour.[53] The hero, who would have already rejected the requests of the ambassadors and of old Phoinix, would finally yield to the will of Patroklos. Such a scene would be necessary in order to explain their close relationship, and subsequently it would offer motivation for Achilleus' attitude in the last scene where he cries for the loss of Patroklos, as well as in the following play where he avenges Hektor. We have a transition from representatives of an anonymous collective to the closest relationship of all, with the one that the hero loves. It is a gradual movement in three steps, and it is logical that the audience would witness this third and final step after they watched the other ambassadors and Phoinix. The case is similar to that of Meleagros and Kleopatra in *Iliad* 9.553-99.[54]

In fifth-century Athens homosexuality would not be perceived as diminishing in any way the manliness of Achilleus and Patroklos; unlike some modern cultures, homosexuality in ancient Greece had no implications of softness.[55] Nor within Greek society would it attract disapproval on moral grounds. Why was the motif of homosexuality inserted, though, and how would this new perspective of the erotic relationship function in the plot? The loss of a lover is more painful than that of a friend. The change, thus, primarily intensifies Achilleus' loss. The change also offers greater theatrical potential because it allows more intense passion to be expressed. The lament, moreover, reminds us of all the choices of Achilleus that led things to this point. The further intensification of grief in the play both accentuates the *peripeteia* and underlines the link between

[53] As suggested by Sommerstein (1996: 340).

[54] As pointed out by Clarke (1978: 394).

[55] Goldhill (1995: 59); Cohen (1991: 189-94); Crompton (2003: 69-74).

decision and consequence and heightens Achilleus' recognition of his tragic error. Of special importance in this direction seems to be the fable (*TrGF* iii fr. 139) that he cites on self-inflicted wounds (cf. pp. 127-8). A further effect of the change relates to the explicit introduction of a contemporary phenomenon. Aischylos brings on stage an epic relationship and redefines it, with the scope of bringing it closer to Athenian experience and increasing the audience's empathy with the events in the play.

Lamenting Patroklos

The battle that followed, the *aristeia* and the death of Patroklos might have been narrated by Antilochos, as is the case in *Iliad* 18.1-35. In the *Myrmidones*, it is Antilochos who brings the news for the death of Patroklos.[56] In *TrGF* iii fr. 138 Achilleus addresses Antilochos.

<AX.>
Ἀντίλοχ', ἀποίμωξόν με τοῦ τεθνηκότος
τὸν ζῶντα μᾶλλον· τἀμὰ γὰρ διοίχεται

In our opinion the fragment should be placed before the arrival of the body of Patroklos on stage and the laments of Achilleus. The same could be the case with *TrGF* iii fr. 139, a fable, apparently spoken by Achilleus, that implies his own responsibility for the death of Patroklos.[57] This is not unlike what happens in the *Iliad* (cf. 18.97-104), where

[56] See Sommerstein (1996: 342), who considers, moreover, Antilochos to be the only non-Myrmidon character in the play and the trilogy. But Phoinix is not a Myrmidon either, even though he is a friend.

[57] Sommerstein (1996: 341-2) reads *TrGF* iii frs. 138-9 as an egotistical outburst of Achilleus, who cries for his own disaster and not for the death of Patroklos. It is rather more plausible that these fragments should be read in a remorseful way. This would accentuate the difference between the harsh behaviour of the hero towards the Achaeans and his behaviour towards his lover.

Achilleus in his grief considers himself responsible for the death of Patroklos because he failed to protect him when needed.

ὧδ' ἐστὶ μύθων τῶν Λιβυστικῶν κλέος,
πληγέντ' ἀτράκτῳ τοξικῷ τὸν αἰετὸν
εἰπεῖν ἰδόντα μηχανὴν πτερώματος·
'τάδ' οὐχ ὑπ' ἄλλων, ἀλλὰ τοῖς αὑτῶν πτεροῖς
ἁλισκόμεθα'

The play would end, most probably, with the arrival of the corpse on stage, which would initiate the laments of Achilleus. The following fragments attest to a powerful scene where Achilleus lamented his dead lover, probably holding his corpse. *TrGF* iii fragments 135-37 are part of Achilleus' lament.

TrGF iii fr. 135:

σέβας δὲ μηρῶν ἁγνὸν οὐκ ἐπῃδέσω,
ὦ δυσχάριστε τῶν πυκνῶν φιλημάτων

TrGF iii fr. **136 is tentatively assigned to the play, but it is very similar to *TrGF* iii fr. 135 and even uses some of the same words. In view of the fact that this sort of physicality was rare in tragedy (cf. pp. 132-3) and the fact that in both attested cases it is related to the relationship of Achilleus and Patroklos and the death of the latter, we would be inclined to accept the assignment.

ΑΧ.
μηρῶν τε τῶν σῶν εὐσεβὴς ὁμιλία
†καλλίωτ†

TrGF iii fr. 137:

<ΑΧ.>

καὶ μήν, φιλῶ γάρ, ἀβδέλυκτ' ἐμοὶ τάδε

Finally the hero would state his need for new weapons to fight with (*TrGF* iii fr. 140: ὅπλων ὅπλων δεῖ). Fragments 133, 141 and 142 are simply of lexicographical interest.

In the *Iliad* we do not witness the moment when Achilleus receives the body of Patroklos, but we see similar feelings of pain expressed when he first learns the news of Patroklos' death (18.22-35) and he is later seen embracing the dead body (19.4-5) while lamenting. The difference between the *Iliad* and the version of Aischylos is that in the latter the lament is explicitly a lover's lament and the physicality is given sexual connotations. Even if the relationship of the two heroes was repeated by other tragedians, in Aischylos it seems to have had an exceptional passion. It is this erotic intensity of the expression of the love of Achilleus and Patroklos that is rare in tragedy. This is all the more important because surviving tragedy is sparing on such erotic expressions, whether homosexual or heterosexual. The case of the lost plays could not have been much different.[58] If strong eroticism was common, especially in Aischylos, then it would be difficult to account for the complete loss even of brief quotations with passionate love as their theme. It would also be difficult to account for Aristophanes' insistence on women in love as a distinguishing feature of Euripides (cf. Ar. *Ra.* 1043-4: Αἰ. ἀλλ' οὐ μὰ Δί' οὐ Φαίδρας ἐπόουν πόρνας οὐδὲ Σθενεβοίας, / οὐδ' οἶδ' οὐδεὶς ἥντιν' ἐρῶσαν πώποτ' ἐποίησα γυναῖκα).

[58] We cannot rule out the possibility that the presence of expressions of homosexual, or even strong expressions of heterosexual love, could in fact be one of the many reasons why certain tragedies that might had included such elements did not reach us.

There are several points to be made in relation to the uniqueness of this erotic lament. Firstly, erotic passion is usually handled differently in tragedy; it is presented in the *Oresteia*, as one of the reasons for Klytaimnestra murdering her husband, as part of the motivation of Deianeira in the *Trachiniai* and of Phaidra in the *Hippolytos*. However, the plays are reticent about the physicality of sex, and although *eros* is spoken of as a motive, passionate desire is rarely expressed. Perhaps Phaidra comes closest to expressing desire. There is of course Phaidra, in the first *Hippolytos* of Euripides, a shameless and unprincipled woman who made her approach in person and on stage and this made Hippolytos cover his face in horror (cf. *TrGF* v frs. 428-47). But the Athenians disapproved of the first *Hippolytos*, which was not popular.[59]

Secondly, in tragedy it is always women who suffer or express *eros* and in all cases it is improper, excessive, always has bad results and leads to a disaster of some kind. On the contrary, tragedy, in general, avoids presenting males with feelings like erotic passion, jealousy or loss. Men are presented as more restrained than women; they are not immune to erotic desire, as we can see in the case of Herakles in Sophokles' *Trachiniai*, but to have a man speak of his erotic/sexual desire is unusual in what survives. In the *Myrmidones* the situation is very different. Erotic passion is clearly expressed by a male, not any male but one of the greatest epic warriors.

[59] See Barrett (1964: 11-12).

Thirdly, the language in the fragments of the *Myrmidones* is surprisingly daring.[60] The words μηρός and φίλημα are words with sexual implications and they are nowhere else used in surviving tragic plays by any author in a similar way. Aischylos is known to use graphic language to refer to sex in his satyr plays,[61] but there is no other instance where this happens in one of his tragedies.

A last surprising element of this lament is the way in which a male warrior laments the death of another male. The lament of Achilleus implies a subversion of traditional gender roles in lamentation. The laments as found in the fragments of the *Myrmidones* are not what one would expect to hear from a male for the death of a warrior at the battlefield. An oration would perhaps be more in accordance with what one would expect to hear by a male.[62] This would reflect a distinction between female and male roles in lament, as suggested by Alexiou; the women cry whereas the men praise.[63] There was, however, a striking contrast between the civic rejection of the lament in Athens and the situation in tragedy, where it was so important.[64] But even in tragedy this was always expressed by women; the ritual of lamentation was often cut short by men, who showed discomfort in the public display of emotion.[65]

---

[60] In lyric poetry there are similar examples: Sappho's fr. 31 is noted for its erotic passion and Archilochos' fr. 196a. Wishing for death if one loses his/her lover is also found in Sappho (cf. fr. 94).

[61] The fragments of the *Diktyoulkoi*, for instance, are daring. See *TrGF* iii frs. 46a; 47a. Sutton (1980: 14) notes references that Aischylos was considered to be among the best satyr poets (e.g. D.L. 2.133).

[62] However, as far as male lamentations are concerned, Admetos in *Alkestis* (cf ll. 861-961) is another exception. His lament is powerful but with no sexual implications. The lament of the Persians in the *Persai* is very powerful but, apparently, reflects barbarian practices.

[63] Alexiou (1974: 102-8).

[64] Loraux (2002: 57).

[65] Sultan (1999: 62-3).

Achilleus laments not the death of his fellow-warrior but the death of the one he loves. The epic precedents, Andromache, for example, suggest that the emphasis in such a lament would be different for a lost husband than for a lost lover. Andromache's lament (*Il.* 22.475-515; 24.723-45), however strong, has no erotic/sexual connotations. Similarly, when women lament their dead men in tragedy, they lament them as fathers and protectors and in relation to their role in the *oikos*, and not as sexual partners. Achilleus' lament in Aischylos could not have been more different.[66]

The shocking physicality of the scene might have been allowed under the circumstances of the death of one of the two lovers. Similar appears to have been the case in Sophokles' *Niobe* where again the strong expression of homosexual love is related to the imminent death of one of the two lovers and this cannot be a coincidence; the two occurrences of homosexuality attested are related to the death of one of the two lovers.[67] The explicitness of the language and the erotic intensity expressed in the *Myrmidones* are, moreover, accompanied by a very strong visual image: Achilleus is probably holding and kissing the body of Patroklos while lamenting (cf. *TrGF* iii fr. 137). The audience, thus, witnesses the complete collapse of the strong and arrogant warrior that had refused the pleas of the Achaeans at the beginning of the play. The Achilleus of the *Myrmidones* is an interesting example of lack of restraint in the Aischylean corpus of *decorum*. This allows the possibility that Aischylos' reputation, like that of the other tragedians, was

[66] For Michelakis (2002: 45) the lamentation of Achilleus identifies him sexually, politically, or ethnically with the 'other'.

[67] See Hadjicosti (2006d: 131-4).

defined in stereotypical form by later ages. The actual corpus of Aischylos, though, possibly had far more diversity than the stereotypes allow.[68]

Homosexuality and the powerful scene of lamentation would allow the Athenian audience to better relate to the pain of the hero and his loss. In this play there is a very strange combination of two sides of Achilleus. Both of them are unlike what we know from the *Iliad*, but both of them are seemingly recognisable to fifth-century Athenians. The audience would perceive the story as that of a general who refuses his services to the collective and who is, at the same time, a sensitive man in love, in accordance with fifth-century homosexual trends. The story that Aischylos tells of Achilleus is the same as in the *Iliad* but seen through the prism of contemporary Athenian reality. This would point to a very innovative reception of an epic story by Aischylos that would allow him to break free from the established Homeric version. The innovations would probably make a sensation in the first performance and would retain a powerful impact in subsequent performances.

The possibility of censorship

If the homosexuality was indeed inserted in the play to accommodate the myth to the practices of fifth-century Athens, then it is ironical that there is a possibility that it was lost for this exact reason in later years. Though the values of a certain era allowed the successful introduction of such material, it should be seriously considered that the perspective of another era on such practices may have caused the loss of the tragedy, and

[68] See the discussion in Csapo (2000: 115-33) for the role of stereotypes in the transmission and reception of comedy.

perhaps of the whole trilogy. Although homosexuality was never wholly approved, it appears to have been regarded by most people as natural and normal for most, if not all, of the pagan period.[69] Openly expressed homosexuality would certainly cause objections in the Christian period, perhaps even earlier than that.[70] We know that in the third century A.D. the tragedy was still read and mentioned in texts written on love. Athenaios c. 200 A.D. discusses the play (cf. p. 125) and the Lucianic dialogue (*Am.* 52) on love – which is the source of *TrGF* iii fr. **136- was written c. 280 A.D. and was very close to fifth-century attitudes to homosexuality.[71]

Sometime in those same years, however, under the rule of the pagan emperor Alexander Severus (222-35 A.D.), we come across the first occasions of condemnation of homosexuality.[72] Nevertheless, it was the coming to power of Christianity that clearly made a difference.[73] The emperor Flavius Valerius Constantinus (Constantine the Great) made laws that reshaped popular morality on the issue: male love was seen as something diabolical and forbidden.[74] The campaign by Constantinus and his successors took a dual form: against paganism and against homosexuality.[75] This twofold campaign was taken

[69] Percy (1996: 186-9); Cohen (1991: 175-80; 186-202); Crompton (2003: 53).

[70] Michelakis (2002: 52-3) suggests that overt references to homosexuality, and not homosexuality itself, started meeting with disapproval as early as the end of the fifth century B.C. and that by fourth century standards Aischylos was violating conventions on the verbal representation of homosexuality. He connects this with the parody of the Aischylean Achilleus by Aristophanes. Aristophanes does not imply the homosexuality of the hero, though.

[71] MacLeod (1967: 147) dates it to the last quarter of the third century A.D.

[72] Crompton (2003: 131).

[73] Percy (1996: 192).

[74] Crompton (2003: 129-30).

[75] Crompton (2003: 131-2).

up by Flavius Petrus Sabbatius Iustinianus in the sixth century, who made even harsher laws related to the punishment of homosexuals.[76]

It is perhaps unsurprising that the *Myrmidones*, with its overt references to homosexual love, did not make it through the censorship of Byzantine years. Even though it told the most prominent story of antiquity, written by one of the greatest classic poets and was very successful in the fifth century (cf. p. 151), it would unlikely be included in the school corpora;[77] evidently it would not be considered didactic. As a result, the vast majority of the public of later eras would never read it. Its survival would thereafter be left to fate and to the few educated bookworms who, even if they had been positive towards its preservation, could not guarantee it.

Since homosexuality as a practice became alien to the public because of Christian morality and prohibited by laws, which were becoming increasingly severe, it would be difficult to see why educated men of those years would be interested in the play or be brave enough to show their interest. The homosexual element, which allowed Athenians to empathise, had no significance for Christians, apart from any moral repugnance for the subject. Therefore probably the play stopped being taught, perhaps even read, and as a result, stopped being copied. Changes in transmission that were established by the fourth

[76] Crompton (2003: 142; 149).

[77] The importance of the schoolroom in the Byzantine years was probably the main reason to reject plays with a content that was not considered didactic. Easterling (1995: 154) notes that this was the reason why no play of Menandros was included in the Byzantine educational corpus. In her view, this was one of the main reasons why the comedian was lost for so long.

century A.D., such as the gradual rejection of papyrus over vellum,[78] the transition from roll to codex,[79] and, finally, the invention of the minuscule in the eight century A.D.,[80] all contributed to the gradual loss of older texts for practical reasons. Sometime around the end of the third century A.D. we can trace the *Myrmidones*, a play on the most well-liked story of antiquity by one of the greatest tragedians, for the last time.

[78] Kenyon (1899: 114-5).

[79] Reynolds and Wilson (1991: 34-5); Roberts and Skeat (1983: 37).

[80] Pasquali (1934: 15); Mioni (1973: 64).

The *Nereides*

Fragments and testimonia

There are fewer fragments surviving from the *Nereides* (*TrGF* iii frs. 150-4) and fewer *testimonia* for the play than for the *Myrmidones*. The chorus consists of Nereids who arrive (*TrGF* iii fr. 150), accompanying Thetis, who has probably heard her son crying for the loss of Patroklos (cf. *Il.* 18.35-7).

δελφινιρὸν πεδίον πόντου
διαμειψάμεναι

The divine chorus of Nereids, which is probably also found in the *Hoplon Krisis*, is of special importance. In the *Hoplon Krisis* the Nereids are probably called to take the crucial decision about who will win the weapons of Achilleus (cf. pp. 53-4). The Nereids have some knowledge of future events, as does Thetis; they can foretell, and their opinion about the events of the story would perhaps have a special gravity, especially when Achilleus exceeds the limits of cruelty in maltreating the body of his opponent. The *parodos* will not have distracted from the lamentations for Patroklos but possibly intensified it by drawing a contrast between the ideal world they have left behind and the sad reality of mortal life. They sing that they have come on dolphins and speak of their sea trip. By coming to lament for Patroklos' death, the Nereids release Achilleus from this role, and he is free to prepare for the battle where he is to kill Hektor. This, of course, has epic antecedents (*Il.* 18.37-69).

TrGF iii fr. 151 is a reference to death.

ἐναροκτάντας δὲ †φθογγ[. . .]κότος† ὑψοῦ
τέλος ἀθανάτων ἀπολείψει

Thetis consoles Achilleus and he states his need for new weapons, possibly disregarding her warnings that he is to die if he kills Hektor (cf. *Il.* 18.70-96). Thetis brings at some point the new weapons, which must have been described at some length, as the following fragment implies that details of the weapons were mentioned.

TrGF iii fr. 152

κάμακος †εἶσι κάμακος† γλώσσημα †διπλάσιον†

TrGF iii fr. 153

λεπτὸς δὲ σινδὼν ἀμφιβαλλέσθω χροΐ

The *sindon* of fr. 153 was probably used by the Nereids to cover the dead body of Patroklos, though this need not have been stage action. *TrGF* iii fr. 154 is of lexicographical interest.

Achilleus, on receiving the weapons, is ready to go to battle apart from one important thing: he still has to resolve his *menis* with Agamemnon. In the *Iliad*, Achilleus renounces his wrath in an assembly and then goes to battle (*Il.* 19.40-55). Within the conventions of Athenian tragedy a tragedian would have difficulty in transferring the action from the camp of the Myrmidons to the place of the assembly, and a simpler solution would have to be invented.[81]

[81] Perhaps Talthybios, accompanied by Eurybates, brings Briseis back to Achilleus in the *Nereides* and not in the *Myrmidones*, as suggested (cf. pp. 112; 158-60). This is far from certain, though.

Thetis would probably be present to receive the news of the battle brought by a messenger. The mother–child relationship between a goddess and a warrior is a theme found in the *Psychostasia* and the *Memnon* as well. This is not the only play of Aischylos that presents a mother awaiting the news of a battle, which is to determine the life or death of her child. Aischylos often prefers mothers as the recipients of battle news (cf. the Persian queen). The parent-child relationship could also be preparing us for the Priamos-Hektor relationship, which will determine the outcome of the third play of the trilogy.

When the news reaches Thetis, its ambiguity would be made clear. Achilleus defeated Hektor, the man who had killed Patroklos, and fulfilled his duty in the memory of his dead lover. But he has gone beyond that. The cruelty with which Achilleus treated the corpse of Hektor may also have been narrated by the messenger to make the final act of the trilogy, the acceptance of Priamos' supplication, more important through contrast.

If the *Nereides* were part of an *Achilleis*, as seems to be the case, then it is the only play of the trilogy in which there is no significant silence from Achilleus. In the first and the third play Achilleus with his silence, for different reasons, refuses to form part of society. If so, the trilogy created interesting relationships between the plays, in that it was a triptych in which the first and third plays were to some degree mirror images (cf. p. 141). In the *Nereides*, on the other hand, Achilleus has an urge to live and join the battle in order to avenge his friend. But his wish for life is short-termed and ensures his subsequent death. The *Nereides* is, in a way, the core of the trilogy. Achilleus reaches

his lowest point of humanity, and his cruelty exceeds all limits to cause the distress of the gods. In the first play, Achilleus was isolated from society because of anger (the Iliadic *menis*). In the second play, he is once again isolated from society by the brutality he shows in killing Hektor. The former victim of Agamemnon's injustice, the bereaved lover crying at the end of the first tragedy, has given way to an implacable warrior, who is still as disorientated as he was at the end of the *Myrmidones*. The following play, the *Phryges/Hektorors Lytra*, begins with Achilleus isolated because of grief (the opening image with Achilleus veiled and silent is telling) only to restore him, eventually, through the expression of his magnanimity to Priamos and the restoration of Hektor.

The *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra*

Fragments and testimonia

The double title is attested for this play in the Catalogue. The argument of the play, as is indicated by the second title, is based on the last Book of the *Iliad*.[82] There are many *testimonia* on different aspects of this play that are helpful. For example, it is clear from ancient *testimonia* that the play started with a prologue scene between Hermes and Achilleus. Hermes comes to inform the hero of the divine decision to allow Priamos to bury his son. Achilleus is silent and veiled according to Aischylos' *Vita* 22-5 (cf. Ar. *Ra.* 911-26):

> ἐν [...] τοῖς Ἕκτορος λύτροις Ἀχιλλεὺς ὁμοίως ἐγκεκαλυμμένος
> οὐ φθέγγεται πλὴν ἐν ἀρχαῖς ὀλίγα πρὸς Ἑρμῆν ἀμοιβαῖα.

Achilleus only exchanges a few words with Hermes in the prologue, apparently in *stichomythia*,[83] after Hermes has revealed the will of the gods. Achilleus could perhaps ask some explanatory questions and then consent. He would then return to his grieving silence. This scene mirrors the similar scene in the *Myrmidones*.[84] Perhaps it signals that the situation is one of deadlock, as it was at the beginning of the first play, when Achilleus chose isolation for different reasons.

---

[82] Radt (1985: 364); Croiset (1894: 178); Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 23-4); Séchan (1926: 115); Gantz (1980b: 146); Schadewaldt (1936: 61-8); Massei (1969: 169); Sommerstein (1996: 344-7); Michelakis (2002: 54-5).

[83] As suggested by Taplin (1972: 64).

[84] Griffith (1977: 201-2); Taplin (1977: 100) speak of mirror scenes, their form and function. The latter notes (*ibid.*: 102-3) such scenes in the *Oresteia* and the *Persai*.

The surviving fragments are few (*TrGF* iii frs. 263-72) and the longest is five lines. *TrGF* iii fr. 263 is probably part of the description of Priamos when he leaves his city carrying gifts for Achilleus, so many in fact that make him look like a merchant (cf. the description of the gifts in *Il.* 24.229-37):

ἀλλὰ ναυβάτην
φορτηγόν, ὅστις ῥῶπον ἐξάγει χθονός

TrGF iii fr. 264 refers to Hektor, who is already dead:

ἀνὴρ δ' ἐκεῖνος (sc. Hektor) ἦν πεπαίτερος μόρων

This small reference has been taken initially to imply Hektor's soft character as Priamos would describe it (cf. *Il.* 24.767-75),[85] but Dover suggested that this was rather a harsh joke at the lips of Achilleus for the colour of Hektor's brutally wounded corpse (cf. *Il.* 22.373-4 where the word μαλακώτερος is used for Hektor when he is dead).[86] Sommerstein, however, points out the past tense of the verb (ἦν) when siding with the earlier interpretation.[87]

TrGF iii fr. 265 speaks of the end of somebody's life, perhaps Achilleus' (cf. *TrGF* iii fr. 138).[88]

διαπεφρούρηται βίος

TrGF iii fr. 266 apparently comes from a speech made to persuade Achilleus to show mercy for the dead enemy for the sake of Dike, perhaps by Hermes.

καὶ τοὺς θανόντας εἰ θέλεις εὐεργετεῖν

[85] Schadewaldt (1936: 65).

[86] Dover (1964: 12).

[87] Sommerstein (1996: 345); Garzya (1995: 50-1).

[88] Garzya (1995: 51-2).

εἴτ' οὖν κακουργεῖν, ἀμφιδεξίως ἔχει·

. . . . . .

καὶ μήτε χαίρειν μήτε λυπεῖσθαι βροτούς.
ἡμῶν γε μέντοι νέμεσις ἐσθ' ὑπερτέρα,
καὶ τοῦ θανόντος ἡ Δίκη πράσσει κότον

TrGF iii fr. 267 is a reference to Andromache:[89]

Ἀνδραίμονος γένεθλον <-> Λυρνησσίου,
ὅθεν περ Ἕκτωρ ἄλοχον ἤγαγεν φίλην

The last five fragments (*TrGF* iii frs. 268-72) are simply of lexicographical interest. There is another interesting piece of information that is noted in ancient sources. The Phrygians were long remembered by the Athenians for their exquisite movement when accompanying Priamos to the Achaean camp to ransom his son in Ar. fr. 696 (*PCG*):

τοὺς Φρύγας οἶδα θεωρῶν,
ὅτε τῷ Πριάμῳ συλλυσόμενοι τὸν παῖδ' ἦλθον τεθνεῶτα,
πολλὰ τοιαυτὶ καὶ τοιαυτὶ καὶ δεῦρο σχηματίσαντας.

Their barbarian dancing apparently made a strong impression on the audience. It is worth devoting a little space to discuss how the Trojan followers of Priamos are turned into barbarians, into Phrygians, as the title of the play suggests. Homer doesn't make the ethnic distinction between Greeks and Trojans-barbarians, and status is never assessed by ethnicity. He only once has the compound adjective *barbarophonos* (*Il.* 2.867), for the Carians, allies of the Trojans in the Trojan catalogue, and not for the Trojans themselves, and makes a distinction between the Trojans and the rest of the allies, who spoke many

[89] Garzya (1995: 46-8). On the other hand, Sommerstein (1996: 346-7) believes that this is a reference to Briseis as a parallel to Andromache, who in this play also comes from Lyrnessus.

different languages (*Il.* 2.803-4). In the *Iliad* the Phrygians were allies of the Trojans and the distinction, geographical and political, between them was clear.

With time the Greeks apparently created an amalgam to which they attributed qualities such as effeminacy, cruelty and luxury. Examples in fifth-century drama that represent the Trojans with barbaric, Persian habits abound.[90] The most significant stage in the process of transforming the Trojans was the fact that they were named Phrygians.[91] A scholiast on the *Iliad* (Σ A 2.862) seems to think that it was Aischylos who first did this.[92] From what we have before Aischylos, only in a fragment by Alkaios is there this identification of Trojans with Phrygians (fr. 42). However, as noted by Hall, the word *Phryges* (l. 15) is an emendation by Wilamowitz, and this could be a possible anachronism, as we do not know of any other conflation so early between the two.[93]

The Persian war was a decisive moment for the creation of the Greek identity.[94] The equation between the mythical and the historical barbarian was intimately connected with the parallel drawn between the Trojan and the Persian wars. Aischylos' *Persai* of 472 B.C. was the product of the process that turned the Persian wars into myth. In the same way, by the reverse process, in one of his plays the tragedian associated the conduct of the mythical Trojans with that of the Phrygians. Representations of barbarians multiply

[90] See Hall (1989: 120-3), for several examples.

[91] Hall (1988: 15-18).

[92] This could be correct, as the scholiast probably had access to more tragedies than we have.

[93] Hall (1988: 17) suggests that other emendations are possible.

[94] J. Hall (2002: 175).

rapidly in the years after the Persian war.[95] Aischylos connected the Persians in the *Persai* with luxury but not with effeminacy or other inferior qualities, which the tragedy of later years attributed to them.[96]

To conclude, the identity of the chorus in this play is an innovation that can be explained in many ways. As suggested, part of the reason for this may have been to relate the unidentified Trojans of myth to existing nations; a further reason could be the Phrygian tradition in music[97] and the barbarians' tolerance of extreme lamentation that could find its use in this play. More importantly, it creates a clear distinction between the general Achilleus, who resembles an Athenian general, and his Trojan adversaries, who are to be perceived as Phrygians/Persians. Perhaps this distinction is created by the poet to be, in part, cancelled: Achilleus presents behaviour that has many barbarian elements such as cruelty and extreme lamentation.

A third group of *testimonia* from antiquity is one that attests that Aischylos had the body of Hektor weighed against the amount of gold that was required for his ransoming (schol. *Il.* 22.351); ὁ δὲ Αἰσχύλος ἐπ' ἀληθείας ἀνθιστάμενον χρυσὸν πεποίηκε πρὸς τὸ Ἕκτορος σῶμα ἐν Φρυξίν. His inspiration for this is no doubt found in a small reference in Homer (*Il.* 22.351), where Achilleus threatens Hektor that he will never

[95] J. Hall (2002: 175).

[96] Aischylos distinguishes the barbarians in his plays, but he does it with no contempt or mockery on his part. For the distinction, see Colvin (1999: 76), who notes that in Aischylos there are many verbal and dramatic devices that are used to describe the non-Greeks; J. Hall (2002: 176). For a discussion of foreign language and accent in tragedy, see Hall (1989: 117-21).

[97] See, for example, Staltmayr (1991: 371).

return his body to his family, not even if they give him his weight in gold.[98] Aischylos recreated this in the *Phryges*, and this is similar to his use of the *psychostasia* motif in the *Psychostasia*, where he elaborates on a detail of the epic text (pp. 171; 178).[99] The weighing of the body against gold is found in later writers, whose model may have been this Aischylean tragedy: cf. Lykophron 269; scholia on the latter; Hyginus *Fab.* 106. Although the divine will for the ransoming is expressed through Hermes, we should expect that, as in the *Iliad*, it will be Achilleus' free will and his magnanimity that will eventually allow the resolution in Aischylos' trilogy. In Book 24 of the *Iliad* the gifts are accepted by Achilleus in one single line (*Il.* 24.579), and they are not mentioned again. The importance is all on the feelings of the two protagonists. The gifts only have a symbolic function, which originates in their importance in epic culture.[100] This could perhaps be the case in the Aischylean tragedy as well.

The first episode would not necessarily bring Priamos on stage. If we have a closer look at the *Iliad*, we will see why his entry may have been postponed. The meeting, mentioned by Zeus as early as 24.75-6, only takes place after line 468ff. Homer insists on the preparations of the old king at Troy and on the description of the gifts, which he brings with him, and thus delays the actual meeting of the two men in a way that heightens our curiosity for the much-awaited meeting. The delay, as well as the fact that we are made to watch the detailed preparations, increases the tension.[101]

---

[98] Taplin (1977: 430) believes that Aischylos presented the weighing on stage.

[99] See the discussion for the weighing scene in iconography in pp. 157-8.

[100] See Hainsworth (1993: 74), for extensive lists of gifts in the *Iliad*.

[101] Owen (1989: 241). See, moreover, Richardson (1993: 321), who notes that the narrative of *Il.* 24.469-76 becomes very rapid.

Prolonging the suspense of the audience is a characteristic of Aischylos, as the *Persai*, the *Seven* and the *Agamemnon* show. In all three cases the main confrontation of the story is delayed while the audience is waiting for it eagerly, and only after repeated setbacks does this take place. The *Phryges* could work in a similar way. Moreover, the fact that it is dangerous for Priamos to enter the Greek camp cannot be ignored. The encounter with Achilleus can only be fraught with menace, which would add to the tension of the scene. *TrGF* iii fr. 263, assigned to this play, presents an unknown speaker describing how Priamos left the city carrying so many gifts that it made him look like a merchant. This does not seem as appropriate in the mouth of Hermes, who has come to carry out the task of informing the hero of the will of the gods, as in the mouth of a messenger, who would inform us of the imminent arrival of the king with all his riches, and recreate in some way the Homeric narration of the preparation and the gifts, as well as the Homeric delay. Who could this speaker be? He could be a Greek spy, or he could even be a herald sent by Priamos to seek safe conduct. It seems improbable that Priamos would enter the Achaean camp secretly – the chorus of Phrygians tells against this, since it is difficult to see how a large body of men could enter the camp unobserved; the entry in the *Iliad* depends on Priamos being alone. The Phrygians, if they entered in the *parodos*, could prepare the ground for his arrival. It is not impossible, though, to suggest that the Phrygians were the second chorus of the play, entering with Priamos.[102]

[102] See p. 53, n. 15.

Priamos would finally arrive in front of the tent of Achilleus where the play possibly takes place.[103] How would Priamos be presented? Certain indications, like *TrGF* iii fr. 263 and the title that points to the transformation of the Trojans into Phrygians with all the entailing implications for barbarian luxury, allow us to think that the king would not arrive as a poor old man but as a proud barbarian king.[104] The presence of attendants suggests that he comes with all the trappings of kingship. This would add to the humility of his supplication and it could also prefigure the fall of Troy, when its king is seen, symbolically, to yield to the power of Achilleus.[105]

The request for a proper burial of Hektor in the *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra* becomes important only if we understand the quality of the man Hektor and the relationships that determined his life and his choices. The *Iliad* ends with the burial of Hektor not only because this signals the eventual fall of the city, but also because he was one of its greatest heroes, and greatest, precisely because he was a versatile hero: a fighter, a father, a husband, a son and so on. In the Aischylean play we lack all this information for Hektor, but the audience need to know who this man is, in order to understand the importance of the return of his body. This would probably be achieved through narration by others (cf. *TrGF* iii fr. 264). His father is certainly a possible candidate to reflect upon his son's qualities, as is the chorus of Phrygians, but it has also been suggested that

[103] Taplin (1972: 68).

[104] For the view that Priam was presented in an Asiatic way based on iconographical indications, see Massei (1969: 170); Croiset (1894: 170); Cambitoglou (1968: 28) and discussion in pp. 157-8; 161-2. If the play was presented after the battle of Marathon (490 B.C.), then the contemporary resonant would be more evident.

[105] For the visual representation of oriental luxury humiliated, see the second entrance of the Queen in the *Persai*.

Hektor's wife accompanied Priamos in the Achaean camp and that she gave a speech along these lines.[106] However, the surviving fragment which is often used to advance the view that she too is present (*TrGF* iii fr. 267) is not necessarily proof of her presence, but simply of a reference made to her. There certainly seems to have been scope for her to be mentioned in the *Phryges*. If, however, she was present, she could have been a mute person, accompanying Priam.[107]

In the *Phryges*, Priamos would, furthermore, supplicate Achilleus and tragedy could certainly present the ritual of the supplication and its acceptance with more formality. This could make a powerful scene: an authoritative, barbarian king, with elaborate, luxurious clothes would be seen kneeling at the feet of Achilleus and, according to Homer, kissing the hands that have killed so many of his sons. Homer has certainly presented it movingly in narrative form, but Aischylos had the means to present it. And he had the inspiration to replace the king of the *Iliad* with a figure more familiar to the Athenians: a Persian-like king who was supplicating the Greeks in the face of Achilleus to show magnanimity. Achilleus, who was also given Athenian characteristics that would make this convergence of the two real-life cultures more evident, would eventually accept the request of Priamos.[108] What would be left to settle now would be the ransom and the preparations for the body of Hektor to be presented to his father and carried

---

[106] See p. 143, n. 89.

[107] Ferrari (1982: 30) believes that Andromache can only be present as a mute character. Note that Andromache was present in the tradition of the ransoming by the time of Dionysios of Syracuse who wrote a play titled *Andromache/Hektoros Lytra*. For this, see p. 152, and Bühler (1973: 69-79); Papathomopoulos (1981: 201).

[108] For supplication as a story pattern, see p. 274, n. 16.

home. The weighing of the gold against the body of Hektor could have been presented at this point.

A last thing that would probably be arranged between the two men would be a truce between the two parties to allow the proper burial and mourning that would be suitable for Hektor and the great hero he was. Priamos would leave in all his royal dignity with his dead son. After a murder and a revenge murder, the characters have achieved reconciliation under divine supervision. The magnanimity of Achilleus to his enemy is a brave personal choice as is the decision of Priamos to enter the enemy camp to request his son's corpse.

The same magnanimity against a fallen enemy is found in another play of Aischylos: the *Persai.* The Persian queen retains her royal structure despite the disaster that Greece inflicted on her people. There is no laughter at the disaster of the enemy, and the audience is actually made to sympathise with the enemy's misfortunes. Priamos, in a possibly early trilogy, could be the model for Aischylean barbarian royalty to follow. He is a respectable figure, as the queen and even Dareios are in the *Persai.* Again we confront a mixing of historical and mythical enemies. Their qualities are interwoven to create this formerly strong but now fallen enemy who is, however, still worthy of respect.

There is a further tragic dimension to this story; the end of the trilogy does not signal the end of the story, as it does not signal the end of the war. The participants of this story, and the audience, all know that the battle between Hektor and Achilleus was not the end

of the war. The winning side will find mercy for the enemy but will continue the preparations for the inevitable next battle. In the *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra*, as in the *Iliad*, the two men crying together in the hut of a camp are enemies and enemies they will remain. The success of the supplication and the momentary realisation of their common *pathos* and pain cannot change this. In the *Iliad*, in twelve days the war will start once more and they will be again on opposite sides. Troy in the *Iliad* is all along fated to fall. Achilleus is fated to die from the arrow of Paris, as Priamos is fated to be slaughtered on the altar by Neoptolemos. No matter how close the two men have come, each will soon be killed by the other's son. It is not improbable that Aischylos alluded in his play to what was to follow this meeting.

Reception of the plays in antiquity

A telling piece of evidence in favour of the continuing popularity of the *Myrmidones* up to the last years of the fifth century B.C. is the repeated use of the play by Aristophanes. If Aristophanes could single this trilogy out even in 405 B.C., this could mean that revivals of the play were performed even in the late fifth century. Furthermore, the wording of Aristophanes' fr. 696.1 (*PCG*) points to revivals (τοὺς Φρύγας οἶδα θεωρῶν).[109]

As far as the rest of drama is concerned, it must be noted that Sophokles wrote a play titled *Phryges* (*TrGF* iv frs. 724-5) and the plot is considered to be the same as the

[109] For revivals in the fifth and later centuries, see p. 313-4.

homonymous play of Aischylos.[110] Sophokles was presumably stimulated by Aischylos' play and its prominent success. According to the scholiast on Aischylos' *Prometheus* (schol. *Pr.* 436), there was another similarity apart from the title: the Sophoklean Achilleus remained silent as well, but, as the scholiast notes, because of *authadeia* (σιωπῶσι παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς τὰ πρόσωπα ἢ δι' αὐθαδίαν, ὡς Ἀχιλλεὺς ἐν τοῖς Φρυξὶ Σοφοκλέους). This supposed *authadeia* is probably related to the hero refusing to yield to the request of Hektor to allow his family to ransom his body, or even to such an admonition by Hermes. The evidence does not allow further speculation about this play. Dionysios of Syracuse wrote a play titled *Hektoros Lytra/Andromache* (*TrGF* i 76 fr. 2a; *testimonium* 3.3), in which apparently Andromache was one of the main characters.[111] On the other hand, the *Myrmidones* and the *Nereides* are only found among the titles of comedy.[112] There are also attested plays entitled *Achilleus* by certain less known poets, such as Karkinos (*TrGF* i 70 fr. 1d), Astydamas (*TrGF* i 60 fr. 1f), Iophon (*TrGF* i 22 fr. 1a), Kleophon (*TrGF* i 77 fr. 3), Euaretos (*TrGF* i 85 *testimonium* 1), Chairemon (*TrGF* i 71 frs. 1a-3c, *Achilleus Thersitoktonos*), Aristarchos of Tegea (*TrGF* i 14 fr. 1a) and Diogenes (*TrGF* i 88 fr. 1a). The surviving fragment by Karkinos and the title of Chairemon's play point to the story of Troy but not necessarily to the Iliadic story.

Roman tragedy also worked on the theme of Achilleus' *menis* and its resolution. Ennius wrote an *Achilles* (frs. 1-19 W). The original for this is considered to be a lost work of

[110] Radt (1977: 493).

[111] See also *addenda* in Kannicht and Snell (1981: 328, fr. 2b). For further reading, see Bühler (1973: 73); Papathomopoulos (1981: 201).

[112] See Strattis (*PCG* fr. 37) and Philemon (*PCG* fr. 46) for the former and Anaxandrides (*PCG* fr. 35) for the latter.

Aristarchos of Tegea and its plot seems to include the embassy.[113] Ennius also wrote a play entitled *Hectoris Lytra* (frs. 162-201 W). The title points to the homonymous Aischylean play, but Warmington suggests that the scope of this tragedy seems to have been broader.[114] It is difficult to determine the extent of Aischylean influence on these plays.

Accius wrote a play entitled *Myrmidones* and another entitled *Epinausimache*. The *Myrmidones*, like the homonymous play of Aischylos, seems to revolve around the story of the embassy and the death of Patroklos (frs. 452-69 W). Frs. 452-7 of Accius' *Myrmidones* present Achilleus addressing Antilochos, and this raises the question of whether the hero was part of the embassy to Achilleus.[115] The *Epinausimache* also seems to include the embassy and the death of Patroklos, but additionally the supplication of Priamos to Achilleus for the body of Hektor (frs. 295-317 W).[116] Earp suggests that since the Romans did not write trilogies, and the two plays were isolated, they could both include the same events.[117] Again it is difficult to take Aischylean influence for granted, when not much survives to be used as an indicator. There are at least three Greek plays on the ransoming of Hektor, and any one of these could have influenced the Romans. However, Aischylos is, as far as we know, the only dramatist who definitely worked on the events before the ransoming.

---

[113] Jocelyn (1967: 161-2).

[114] Warmington i (1936: 272-3).

[115] Earp (1939: 42); Barabino (1956: 60); Warmington ii (1936: 480ff.).

[116] Warmington ii (1936: 428ff.).

[117] Earp (1939: 104-5).

Iconography and the Aischylean story of Achilleus

The story of Achilleus, as told by Aischylos in these three plays, has been often connected to images from iconography. The influence of Aischylos has been seen both on vases of the early fifth century and on south-Italian vases of later centuries. One has to make a distinction when discussing the two categories of iconographical sources (cf. pp. 22-7). The proposed connections will be briefly discussed here starting with the vases of the first half of the fifth century that have been related to the three plays.

The *Myrmidones* has been connected with a specific image that appears on black-figure vases in Attica from 490 to 470 B.C.: the image of the veiled Achilleus (cf. *LIMC* Achilleus 439-54).[118] The image is consistent, has chronological and geographical limits,[119] is different from the presentation of Achilleus in the *Iliad*, and it has been suggested that it is very similar to the presentation of Achilleus by Aischylos, as we know it from other sources (cf. *Ra.* 911-24; schol. Ra. 911-3; *Vita* 23-5). On these vases, Achilleus is always confronted by Odysseus, in what appears to be a form of an embassy, and this led to suggestions that Odysseus was the ambassador in Aischylos' play.[120] Although in Aischylos the identity of the ambassadors is not clear on the surviving evidence, the possibility that Odysseus was the ambassador should not be considered improbable (cf. p. 114). Vase-painters, however, were free to add characters on vases or

[118] Kossatz-Deissmann *LIMC* i (1981: 113) and (1978: 11-3); Hammond and Moon (1978: 371); Döhle (1983: 168-9); Woodford (1993: 73-4); Michelakis (2002: 31).

[119] Michelakis (2002: 31).

[120] Döhle (1983: 168); Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 11-3); Michelakis (2002: 30-1).

conflate sources and, as a result, this connection between a supposed Aischylean version that would include Odysseus and the group of vases is far from certain.

Séchan, moreover, noted the pre-existence of the motif of a person who wears a mantle in art before it was attached to the story of Achilleus.[121] This could mean that both Aischylos and the vase-painters gave Achilleus a recognisable way of visually expressing a specific attitude. Thus, not only the presence of Odysseus in the scene is not irrefutably the result of Aischylos' play, but also the mantle had been a pre-existing theme in iconographical tradition before it was attached to the silent Achilleus of Aischylos.

In addition to this, there might be a problem of incompatibility with the date of one of these vases and the career of Aischylos. Aischylos won his first victory in 484 B.C. (Marmor Parium A50), fourteen years after his first performance in 498 B.C. The date of the vases in question has often been used as a *terminus ante quem* for the *Myrmidones*,[122] but there are still some reservations for connecting the play with the earlier of these vases, a vase by the Eucharides painter (*LIMC* Achilleus 448), which is dated to 500-490 B.C.[123]

The *Nereides* has also been connected with two images that have been repeatedly presented by iconography of the early fifth century and are occasionally fused. The first

[121] Séchan (1926: 14-5).

[122] Michelakis (2002: 31); Kossatz-Deissmann *LIMC* i (1981: 113); Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 11-2); Hammond and Moon (1978: 371); Döhle (1983: 168-9).

[123] Kossatz-Deissman *LIMC* i (1981: 110; 114); Friis Johansen (1967: 166, fig. 63 and *ibid.*: 166-8) speaks of a vase that served as a prototype for the Eucharides painter and the other artists who depicted the scene.

image that has been connected to the play is the arming scene of Achilleus, after the death of Patroklos, in the presence of the Nereids.[124] What is significant about this scene is that the Nereids first appear in representations of the second arming accompanying Thetis after 480-470 B.C. (*LIMC* Achilleus 511; 513; 515; 519-525).[125] By that time, Thetis was always alone in images of the scene, as she is in *Iliad* 19.1-15. The Nereids formed the chorus of the homonymous play of Aischylos and they were probably related to the arming of Achilleus (cf. *TrGF* iii fr. 152). There is no firm evidence that Aischylos was the first to insert the Nereids in this episode, however.

Secondly, the *Nereides* has been connected with the image of the Nereids travelling across the sea on dolphins, as this is implied by *TrGF* iii fr. 150. Nereids on dolphins or sea-monsters constitute a repeated theme on vases especially from 450 B.C. onwards (*LIMC* Achilleus 524; 513; 519; Nereides 371), and Trendall and Webster, and others, see the influence of the Aischylean chorus on the original artist.[126] Two Melian reliefs of the 470s-460s B.C. also depict the Nereids on sea animals and have been related to the play of Aischylos.[127] There have been suggestions that the Nereids would arrive on stage

[124] Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 14-5); Kossatz-Deissmann *LIMC* i (1981: 127); Döhle (1983: 169); Icard-Gianolo and Szabados *LIMC* vi (1992: 822); Barringer (1995: 21); Michelakis (2002: 53, n. 71) considers the influence of the arming scene in iconography to be proof against the views of West (cf. pp. 58-9), for the sequence of the plays in the trilogy.

[125] The earliest is *LIMC* Achilleus 524a dated to 480-70 B.C. See Kossatz-Deissmann *LIMC* i (1981: 125); Isler-Kerényi (1977: 16-20, pll. 6a-b).

[126] Trendall and Webster (1971: 54); Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 16); Barringer (1995: 21; 30-1); Michelakis (2002: 53).

[127] Barringer (1995: 39-40, pll. 36-7).

on carts decorated as dolphins,[128] but there is no evidence to support this. Alternatively, the Nereids could simply narrate their sea journey when they are already on stage. In this case, the vase-painter would turn what would be narrative in the play into action on the vase, if indeed the image on the vases is the influence of this play. It is not impossible that the outbreak of these two images (the second arming of Achilleus and the sea journey of the Nereids) in the first half of the fifth century was related to the influence of the version of the episode that Aischylos presented in theatre, but this cannot exceed the limits of conjecture.

The influence of the *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra* on iconography of the first quarter of the fifth century B.C. has also been claimed on the strength of various arguments. This suggestion was largely based on an Attic black-figure skyphos, the work of the Brygos painter (*LIMC* Achilleus 659) usually dated between 490 and 470 B.C.[129] The oriental presentation of Priamos on the vase has raised questions on the origin of this transformation of the mythical Trojans to Persians. There is no doubt that Aischylos presented the Trojans in his play *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra* as orientalised Phrygians and that he was principally responsible for the transformation of the mythical Trojans into contemporary barbarians.[130] Although the image on the vase is consistent with the presentation of the Trojans as Phrygians in the play of Aischylos, there is one more

[128] Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 16); Barringer (1995: 21).

[129] Kossatz-Deissmann *LIMC* i (1981: 150) suggests 490 B.C.; Massei (1969: 170, n. 74) dates the vase to 480 B.C.; Danali-Giole (1981: 59), agrees with the influence of Aischylos on the vase but dates it to the 470s B.C. On the other hand, Cambitoglou (1968: 28), in an attempt to explain the oriental transformation of Priamos without the aid of literature, reaches the conclusion that the answer lies with the painter's non-Greek origin.

[130] See pp. 143-5.

possibility that should be allowed: the vase-painter and the poet could be responding to a larger cultural shift that presented the Trojans orientalised as Persians. The possibility that we might be interpreting elements as oriental when they are not should also be taken into account.[131]

Other suggestions for the influence of the *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra* on visual art have been related to the scene of the weighing of the gold against Hektor's body. This scene is known to be distinctively Aischylean (schol. *Il.* 22.351); perhaps the poet presented this on stage (cf. p. 146, n. 98). One such image on a Melian relief (*LIMC* Achilleus 662) is dated to 450-40 B.C.[132] As in the cases mentioned above there is no conclusive evidence to verify its Aischylean origin.

Iconography has been used, moreover, to confirm, what we all suspect, the existence of a trilogy on Achilleus consisting of the three plays. The vase employed was a red-figure kalyx-crater by Polygnotos (*LIMC* Achilleus 480; 524; 660), dated to 450-30 B.C.,[133] for which it has been suggested that it presented images from all three Aischylean plays and, therefore, of the connected Aischylean trilogy.[134] On this vase, there are three images that have been occasionally related to the story of Achilleus: the ransoming of Hektor

[131] Doubts have been expressed by Small (2003: 77; 57), for example, when discussing south-Italian vases, who believes that oriental costumes on vases should not be considered a sure indicator of tragedy but only of a particular kind of dress.

[132] Kossatz-Deissmann *LIMC* i (1981: 151; 159); Graham (1958: 315); Trendall and Webster (1971: 55); Garzya (1991: 45); Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 24-5).

[133] Kossatz-Deissmann *LIMC* i (1981: 150) dates the vase to 430 B.C. Trendall and Webster (1971: 54); Barringer (1995: 32-3) date the vase to 450-40 B.C.

[134] Trendall and Webster (1971: 54); Barringer (1995: 32-3).

(*LIMC* Achilleus 660) to the *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra*, the Nereids travelling on dolphins (*LIMC* Achilleus 524) to the *Nereides* and Talthybios returning Briseis to Achilleus who is lamenting for Patroklos to the *Myrmidones* (*LIMC* Achilleus 524).

There are fewer problems with assigning the first two images to Aischylos than with assigning the third. Aischylos certainly orientalised the Trojans into Phrygians, and although he was followed by most poets of his century, the image could, supposedly, reflect his *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra*. The scene with the Nereids could also, supposedly, be the result of Aischylos' play, if the painter turned narrative into action.[135] These two images are different in content from what we find in the *Iliad*, for example, and they have been related to the story as it was to be found in Aischylos by other sources.

The main problem is the third image that includes Talthybios and Briseis. There is no secure evidence that Talthybios brought Briseis back to Achilleus, after the hero decided to rejoin the battle in Aischylos, although this is often suggested. The disputed scholion related to Aischylos (schol. A. *Pr.* 441) to prove the presence of Talthybios, does not mention the name of the author, or the title of the play, speaks of a different task for Talthybios (summoning Achilleus to battle in a context of silence) and can hardly be considered proof for the presence of the herald in the Aischylean play. In addition to this, the lamentation of Achilleus takes place at the end of the *Myrmidones* and it is difficult to see how Talthybios could enter with Briseis in the middle of the lamentations (cf. pp.

[135] The journey of the Nereids on dolphins could have been narrated in the *Nereides* and this might be of some importance when it comes to deciding the degree of accuracy that should be allowed for the vase, even if inspired by Aischylos.

127-8). The case with the vase of Polygnotos is pushed to the limits of how much we can really infer from a vase, especially one that does not acknowledge theatrical influences in any way. Tempting as it may be to accept this connection, the vase is not proof for the trilogy, which is not, nevertheless, improbable in itself.

Aischylos' version of the Iliad and later iconography

South-Italian vases were occasionally inspired by revival performances of drama, and sometimes acknowledged their theatrical influences.[136] The version of the *Iliad* that Aischylos presented in the theatre has been related to certain south-Italian vases, as well.

The image of the veiled Achilleus is not to be found on South-Italian vases.[137] The influence of Aischylos, nevertheless, has been suggested for a south-Italian vase dated to the first quarter of the fourth century in relation to the *Nereides* and the second arming scene (*LIMC* Achilleus 527).[138] The vase is a volute-crater from Apulia. On the vase Achilleus is seen seated, next to him on the left stand Odysseus and Talthybios, whereas on the right stands Automedon and Antilochos is depicted sitting on a rock. Below, a Nereid, perhaps Thetis, is carrying part of the armour, and another woman, probably another Nereid,[139] is sitting and looking at Achilleus. It has been suggested that the characters could come from different moments in the play, perhaps from a reconciliation scene between the Achaeans and Achilleus that would involve Talthybios returning

[136] See p. 24.

[137] As noted by Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 13).

[138] Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 18-20, K 1); Kossatz-Deissmann *LIMC* i (1981: 128). For the vase, see Barringer (1995: 37, pl. 30).

[139] Barringer (1995: 37) notes that the identification of the second Nereid is tentative.

Briseis.[140] There is no evidence, however, for the presence of Talthybios or Automedon in the play of Aischylos and Antilochos' presence is only attested for the *Myrmidones*.

The *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra* has also been considered to have influenced iconography of later centuries (*LIMC* Achilleus 663-667).[141] Among the vases discussed, the most interesting is the Hermitage vase, a volute-crater from Apulia (*LIMC* Achilleus 664) dated to 350 B.C.[142] The vase depicts not the supplication of Priamos to Achilleus but a later moment of the action, the moment when Hektor's corpse is carried to the chariot while Priamos is watching. Priamos is depicted in oriental outfit, wearing a tiara and kneeling in a way that recalls a *proskynesis*. Thetis is also present, as are two servants who are carrying the body of Hektor.[143] On the upper zone of the vase Achilleus sits in his *klisia*, Athena and Hermes are present,[144] as are Nestor and his son Antilochos, and the corpse of Patroklos is also depicted. It is not improbable that the vase-painter added some characters,[145] if indeed the vase was influenced by a specific Aischylean performance. Nevertheless, the evidence is still poor for conclusively relating the vase to Aischylos. Sophokles wrote a homonymous play and it is unclear how similar this would be to the play of Aischylos. What is more, the freedom of the vase-painters and the possibility of other sources available to them should not be disregarded.

---

[140] Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 20-1); Kossatz-Deissmann *LIMC* i (1981: 128); Barringer (1995: 37).

[141] Kossatz-Deissmann *LIMC* i (1981: 160). See also Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 25, K 2-6).

[142] Kossatz-Deissmann *LIMC* i (1981: 151).

[143] Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 26-7 K 4); Kossatz-Deissmann *LIMC* i (1981: 151; 160); Trendall-Webster (1971: 55); Döhle (1983: 169-70).

[144] Hermes speaks the prologue in Aischylos, but there is no role for Athena on the existing evidence for the play.

[145] Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 27); Kossatz-Deissmann *LIMC* i (1981: 160).

A *proskynesis* of Priamos to Achilleus, apparently related to the supplication, is also attested on two fragmentary vases from Apulia (*LIMC Achilleus* 665, 666), which have been connected to the play of Aischylos.[146] Priamos is in oriental outfit in both cases and the figure standing next to him in *LIMC* 665 has been considered to be Hermes.[147] There is no secure evidence that the vases should be related to the Aischylean play, although the connection is not impossible. We should always keep in mind the problems related to iconographical sources (as set out in pp. 22-7).

[146] Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 25, K5-6).

[147] Kossatz-Deissmann *LIMC* i (1981: 151, pl. 665); Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 28-9, K5).

The Memnon tragedies

The story of Memnon was narrated in the *Aithiopis*. The summary by Proklos (*PEG argumentum* 10-5) reads:

> Μέμνων δὲ ὁ Ἠοῦς υἱὸς ἔχων ἡφαιστότευκτον πανοπλίαν παραγίνεται τοῖς Τρωσὶ βοηθήσων· καὶ Θέτις τῷ παιδὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Μέμνονα προλέγει. καὶ συμβολῆς γενομένης Ἀντίλοχος ὑπὸ Μέμνονος ἀναιρεῖται. ἔπειτα Ἀχιλλεὺς Μέμνονα κτείνει· καὶ τούτῳ μὲν Ἠὼς παρὰ Διὸς αἰτησαμένη ἀθανασίαν δίδωσι.

There is also a brief reference in the *Odyssey* (4.187-8) mentioning Memnon as the killer of Antilochos, and one in Hesiod's *Theogonia* (l. 984) that Eos gave birth to Memnon, the king of the Aethiopians. A dithyramb by Simonides titled *Memnon* (*PMG* 539) does not survive but is attested. A *testimonium* (Str. 15.3.2), however, shows that in Simonides the hero was buried and, therefore, not granted immortality, in contradistinction to the *Aithiopis*. A fragment of Alkman (*PMG* 68) also mentions Memnon, with no further evidence that there was actually a poem that dealt with his story. In subsequent non-dramatic poetry the story is found in Apollodoros *Epit.* 5.3; D.S. 2.22.5;[1] Str. 15.3.2; Q.S. 2. 100-666 and Ovidius *Met.* 12. 576-622. Lastly, the death of Antilochos at the hands of Memnon is mentioned by Pindar with a few more details (*P.* 6.28-42).

[1] It is noteworthy that the immortality which Memnon was granted by Zeus after his death is refuted by Diodoros who says that his body was burnt. This version could have originated from the same source as Simonides' dithyramb, where the body was buried in Syria.

Two Aischylean tragedies, the *Memnon* and the *Psychostasia*, are considered to revolve around the myth of Memnon, the king of the Aethiopians, who came to Troy as the ally of Priamos following Hektor's death and was killed by Achilleus. It is improbable that Aischylos would have written two plays on the battle between Achilleus and Memnon, and the death of the latter. The other episode that could be used by drama with profit would be the death of Antilochos at the hands of Memnon. It seems probable that the *Memnon* and the *Psychostasia* would narrate two different incidents of the hero's life. If the two plays treated different episodes, this opens the possibility that they were connected in a trilogy. Many scholars have raised this to the level of probability.[2] However, the fragility of such a connection should always be kept in mind, as the case of Sophokles' two Oidipous plays- which would have been easily assigned to the same trilogy had there been no evidence against it- shows. The current study assumes that the stories of the two plays, even if not included in the same trilogy, would have been mutually complementary to some extent. This constitutes the main reason why the tragedies are discussed in a joint chapter.

[2] Sommerstein (1996: 56-7), for example, assigns with confidence the two plays to a trilogy narrating the events of the *Aithiopis*. For other suggestions for possible trilogies that would include both the *Memnon* and the *Psychostasia*, see pp. 183-5.

The *Memnon*

Fragments and testimonia

The first play to be discussed will be the *Memnon*. Nothing actually attests that the *Memnon* narrates events prior to those of the *Psychostasia* but we are led to this conclusion because of the argument of the latter, which would probably present the weighing of the souls as well as the fulfilment of the *psychostasia*, the death of Memnon. If, as argued above, the plays had distinct themes it seems probable that the story of the *Memnon* precedes that of the *Psychostasia* and the death of the hero.

The title is attested in the Catalogue and there are further references in Ar. *Ra.* 962 (Κύκνους ποιῶν καὶ Μέμνονας κωδωνοφαλαροπώλους) and in Poll. 4.109 (εἰ δὲ τέταρτος ὑποκριτής τι παραφθέγξαιτο, τοῦτο παραχορήγημα ὀνομάζεται, καὶ πεπρᾶχθαί φασιν αὐτὸ ἐν Μέμνονι). Both *testimonia* are to be discussed later. The few fragments assigned to this play by ancient sources (*TrGF* iii frs. 127-130) are hardly of any help to us as far as the plot is concerned. *TrGF* iii fr. **127 reads: καὶ μὴν πελάζει καὶ καταψύχει πνοὴ / ἄρκειος ὡς ναύτησιν ἀσκεύοις μολών. *TrGF* iii fr. *128 could be part of a weapon description: χαλκὸν ἀθέρητον (?) ἀσπίδος <θ'> ὑπερτενῆ. *TrGF* iii frs. *129-*130 are of lexicographical interest.

There is, moreover, a fragment assigned occasionally by modern scholars to the *Memnon* and this is *TrGF* iii fr. 300.[3] The speaker is not identified in our source as Memnon but

[3] The fragment is only cited under the name of Aischylos, with no indication for the title of the play that would have included it, and is edited by Radt (1985: 391-4) in the *incertarum fabularum* section of his

the content identifies the speaker as Aethiopian and the heroic tenor of the proud reference to his heritage strongly suggests a heroic speaker. The assignment to the *Memnon* seems probable and the fragment may come from a scene in which the hero introduces himself on arrival at the Trojan fields by speaking of his lineage and his country (cf. Q.S. 2.115ff.). *TrGF* iii fr. 300 follows:

> γένος μὲν αἰνεῖν ἐκμαθὼν ἐπίσταμαι
> Αἰθιοπίδος γῆς, Νεῖλος ἔνθ' ἑπτάρρος
> †γαῖαν† κυλίνδει πνευμάτων ἐπομβρίᾳ,
> ἐν ᾗ πυρωπὸν ἥλιος ἐκλάμψας φλόγα
> τήκει πετραίαν χιόνα· πᾶσα δ' εὐθαλὴς
> Αἴγυπτος ἀγνοῦ νάματος πληρουμένη
> φερέσβιον Δήμητρος ἀντέλλει στάχυν

In archaic epic Memnon is one of a series of champions of Troy, each one expecting or being expected to save the city. We may reasonably assume that, when Memnon arrives at Troy, the besieged and defenceless city regains its hope and lives through its last period of strength before the final collapse. Memnon kills Antilochos, Achilleus' friend (cf. Pi. *P.* 6.28-42), and is then himself killed by Achilleus.[4] There is a surviving text that can offer us a detailed description of this myth. In Q.S., where the story is told at length, Memnon kills Antilochos (2.256-9) and this causes the wrath of Achilleus, they then meet at the battlefield and Memnon insults Achilleus' mother for being a lesser goddess than his own mother and the battle begins (2.412-29). A *kerostasia* takes place at Olympus during a long battle between the two with Thetis and her sisters being afraid of

---

edition. See Radt (1985: 391), where suggestions for the assignment of the fragment to the *Memnon* are noted.

[4] For suggestions on the plot of the play, see Mette (1963: 111); Ferrari (1982: 176-7); March (1998: 251).

the outcome (2. 481-516). It should be noted that it is always the case with Memnon that he is presented in myth as an equal to Achilleus, something that does not happen with Hektor: Memnon has a divine mother who can act as an intermediary between himself and the gods, and his armour is made by Hephaistos.[5]

It has been suggested that in the *Memnon* the hero makes a chariot-borne entry, as we can infer from Aristophanes (*Ra.* 962).[6] Such an impressive entry would be in accordance with the importance that the Aethiopian prince would have in the action of the play and could, moreover, be an interesting contrast with the possible appearance of his dead body on stage in the *Psychostasia* in the case of a trilogy.[7] Moreover, it would mean that Aischylos attributed to the Aethiopian prince characteristics that would signal his barbarian royal class.[8] His entry could be similar to that of the Persian queen in *Persai* (ll. 154ff.), as implied in *Persai* 607-9.[9]

---

[5] These similarities led to an effort by neoanalysis to explain certain parallels between the story of Memnon and the *Iliad* by talking of a *Memnonis*, perhaps a kind of prototype for the *Aithiopis*, on which much of what we read in the *Iliad* is based. See Schoeck (1961: 38ff.); Kakridis (1949: 94-5); Burkert (1985: 121); Willcock (1997: 175ff.).

[6] Taplin (1977: 422) notes that in the *Memnon* the hero enters in a spectacular way as does the hero of the spurious *Rhesos* (l. 264). For the *Rhesos*' authenticity problem, see *TrGF* v *testimonium* A.IA.1.28-9. See further, Goossens (1932); Grégoire (1933); Pagani (1970); Ritchie (1964); Björck (1957). Note that the *Rhesos* could of course draw on the *Memnon*.

[7] See p. 141, n. 84, for mirror scenes and their function.

[8] See Taplin (1977: 78), for the view that chariot entries of royalty, particularly of oriental royalty, were in the early pre-*skene* theatre a matter of course and called for no particular comment.

[9] See discussion in Hall (1996: 120; 150), for the two entrances of the Persian queen.

It is often the choice of Aischylos to mix elements from the profile of contemporary barbarians into that of mythical Easterners. There is, in fact, a group of plays that present a number of contemporary barbarian elements including, for example, the *Persai*, the *Kares/Europe* and the *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra*.[10] The *Memnon* would most probably resemble the *Persai* and the *Kares/Europe* in that the story takes place in a barbarian setting and all, or most, of the characters would probably be barbarians.

TrGF iii fr. 300, probably part of a speech of Memnon where his identity and origins are made known, is plausibly directed towards an audience of Trojans, perhaps on the occasion of this entry, rather than towards an Achaean audience with whom the hero would only be involved in fighting. The chorus could consist of Trojan elders and less probably Aethiopians, as they would have to remain on stage during the off-stage fighting of Memnon, whereas the companions of Memnon would have to follow their leader into battle. A chorus of Trojans could, moreover, have an important narrative function, since they would be well placed to explain in an opening song the history of the war so far. The chorus would witness in agony the developments that take place from inside the Trojan camp. The role of the elders, as non-combatants, would allow them the narrative function of the non-combatant chorus that is left behind in the *Persai* and in the *Agamemnon*.

This leads us to seek the other characters of this play. There is a scholion related to the *Memnon* (Poll. 4.109), cited above, concerning the use of a fourth actor in the play. The

[10] See pp. 143-5; 200-5.

scholion, however suspect, is not impossible for a play of which we know so little.[11] The tentative note in Polydeukes may suggest that the use of the fourth actor was not certain; however, the fact that scholars argued for the use of a fourth actor makes it virtually certain that this was at least a three-actor play. The fact that some sources attributed the third actor to Sophokles (Arist. *Po.* 1449a.18-9; *Vita* 20-3) indicates that it belonged to the latter stage of the career of Aischylos. However, there is no secure date for when Aischylos first used the third actor.[12] It is logical that a representative of the Trojan authority, perhaps Priamos himself, would be present to welcome the hero and brief him on the current situation (cf. Q.S. 2.100-60).

The play might be different, however, from other barbarian plays, such as the *Kares/Europe* and the *Persai*, in that it would present the *aristeia* of the hero, not his fall, if the *Psychostasia* was indeed to follow. This would then be a barbarian *aristeia*. One should not forget that in the fifth-century Greek consciousness the Trojans and their allies were to some extent equated with the Persians, and that Aischylos had played a role in the creation of this equation.[13] How easy would it then be for the poet to present a hostile nation or their equivalent in myth, in a time of triumph? It would actually be less problematic to present them as under pressure or defeated. Perhaps this is why Aischylos produced more plays on barbarian defeats and their results (cf. *Persai*, *Kares/Europe*,

---

[11] Hammond (1972: 445-6) considers the scholion to be suspect. See Radt (1985: 237) for more objections. West (2000: 345) does not consider a brief use of a fourth actor improbable in this case, because of the intervention of Pylades in the *Choephoroi*.

[12] See Brown (1984: 1-7) on the authenticity of Arist. *Po.* 1449a.18-9; Taplin (1977: 432; 352) believes the third actor to be an innovation of Aischylos' last years. For more see Taplin (*ibid.*: 185-6).

[13] See pp. 142-3.

Phryges/Hektoros Lytra, Psychostasia) than on barbarian successes. The *Memnon* can perhaps be better comprehended if seen to include either the death of the hero following his *aristeia*, or as part of a trilogy, followed by the *Psychostasia* and the death of the hero there.[14] If the *Memnon* ends with the triumph of Memnon and the play is part of a trilogy, then this triumph is counteracted and cancelled by the next play (e.g. the *Agamemnon* ends with the usurpers in the ascendant and the next play opens with the return of the avenger before proceeding to reverse the situation and action of the *Agamemnon* in detail). The death of Memnon would make the barbarian triumph, however impressive, ephemeral.

Two more tragedies are attested with the same title, nothing of which survives. One is attested for Sophokles (*argumentum AGRQ* S. *Aj.*),[15] and the other is attested under the name of Timesitheos (*TrGF* i 214), a poet of uncertain date.

[14] The *Myrmidones* of Aischylos, for example, would probably focus on the death of Patroklos more than it would on the *aristeia* of Hektor, as the action takes place in the Achaean camp. Additionally, the *aristeia* of Hektor in the *Myrmidones* is to be overthrown in the second play of the trilogy, the *Nereides*, where the death of the Trojan hero takes place. See pp. 137-9.

[15] See Radt (1977: 347).

The Psychostasia: divine helplessness

Fragments and testimonia

The title is attested in the Catalogue. The fragments under this title (*TrGF* iii frs. 279, 280, 280a) are merely of lexicographical interest. There is, however, a considerable amount of *testimonia* for this tragedy, mostly in relation to the weighing of souls that gives the play its title. As it is clear from the title and the *testimonia*, the *Psychostasia* revolved around the weighing of the souls of Achilleus and Memnon, performed by the gods in order to see who was fated to die. There are a few more elements that can be extracted from the *testimonia*. There are recurring references to the weighing of the souls in relation to the weighing of the fates in the *Iliad*, the suggested source of Aischylos (schol. *Il.* 8.70).

These scholiasts actually believe that the substitution of the fates by the souls was due to a mistake of the tragedian, who mistook the female KHP as the neuter. However, the suggestion of Aischylos' misunderstanding of the *kerostasia* as *psychostasia* is implausible, as the former seems to have been famous from its presentation in Homer. Apparently Aischylos consciously replaced the fates with the souls. Perhaps the souls could be more personal than the fates, or else the absence of the latter from the story could allow more space for individuality and makes clearer what is on stake for the individual. Additionally, with this innovation the poet distances himself from the previous versions of the weighing.

A puzzling question has been whether the *psychostasia* was narrated or presented on stage and, if so, in what way this was done. Ploutarchos suggests that Aischylos presented the weighing in his *Psychostasia* (*Mor.* 17 A 7). The passage reads:

> τραγῳδίαν ὁ Αἰσχύλος ὅλην τῷ μύθῳ περιέθηκεν, ἐπιγράψας Ψυχοστασίαν καὶ παραστήσας ταῖς πλάστιγξι τοῦ Διὸς ἔνθεν μὲν τὴν Θέτιν, ἔνθεν δὲ τὴν Ἠῶ, δεομένας ὑπὲρ τῶν υἱέων μαχομένων.

Polydeukes gives a further testimony for an on-stage *psychostasia*, where he notes that Zeus and those around him are standing on the *theologeion* (4.130).[16] The passage reads:

> ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ θεολογείου ὄντος ὑπὲρ τὴν σκηνὴν ἐν ὕψει ἐπιφαίνονται θεοὶ, ὡς ὁ Ζεὺς καὶ οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν ἐν Ψυχοστασίᾳ.

These *testimonia* have led researchers to make various suggestions on exactly how the *psychostasia* would have been presented. There have been suggestions that a scene on Olympus was taking place in the play.[17] This, however, would involve a change of scene. Given the rarity of change of scene in tragedy and the absence of further evidence to support it, this must remain a remote hypothesis, especially when one of the scenes would have to take place on a divine level and the others on a mortal level.[18] On the

---

[16] Since Polydeukes does not name Aischylos, it may not be implausible to suggest that another play could also include a *psychostasia*, whether on or off stage.

[17] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1914: 246).

[18] Taplin (1977: 103-4) notes that the change of scene is a rarely used resource, although there are such occurrences in Sophokles' *Aias*, in Aischylos' *Eumenides* and in a satyr drama of Sophokles entitled

other hand, there have been several suggestions that the scene would involve the use of the *theologeion*, or of the upper part of the stage.[19] Objections have been raised on whether the *theologeion* was available to Aischylos himself or added for a revival of the play.[20] The latter possibility is discussed by Sourvinou-Inwood, who believes that, whereas a revival performance could have added the *theologeion*, it could not have inserted the scene.[21] In fact, we cannot exclude the possibility of a large-scale interpolation given the extreme probability that the ending of the *Seven* and the beginning of Euripides' *IA* were additions.[22]

An on-stage *psychostasia* would involve, apart from the *theologeion*, what is for some a further problem: the presence of Zeus, who never appears in surviving tragedies.[23] This absence reflects a tradition begun in epic in which there is no direct interaction of Zeus

---

Achilleos Erastai (cf. *TrGF* iv frs. 149-157a), as attested by the *hypothesis* to the *Aitnaiai* (P. Oxy. 2257 fr. 1.5ff.). For the latter, see Radt (1985: 126-7).

[19] See West (2000: 345-347); Arnott (1962: 118), for suggestions involving the *theologeion*. See Mette (1963: 112); Mastronarde (1990: 281-4), for suggestions for the use of the upper part of the stage or the roof.

[20] For a discussion on the improbable use of the *theologeion* by Aischylos, see pp. 207-8.

[21] Sourvinou-Inwood (2003: 463-4).

[22] See Hutchinson (1985: 209-11), for a brief discussion and bibliography on the interpolation problem of the *Seven*. See Gurd (2005), for bibliography and thorough discussion on the interpolation problem of the *IA*.

[23] See Taplin (1977: 431-2); Easterling (1993b: 78-9). See, moreover, S. West (1984: 294-5), who suggests that Zeus is present in Euripides' *Alkmene*, but does not, however, accept that he was present in the *Psychostasia* (*ibid.*: 295, n. 15). On the contrary, West (2000: 345); Sourvinou-Inwood (2003: 463) see Zeus on stage in this play. Although there are certain gods who do not usually appear on stage, the paucity of our evidence as far as tragedy is concerned should be kept into mind. For example, Hera is one of the gods who are not usually on stage in tragedy, but she is present as a disguised character in a lost play of Aischylos (cf. *TrGF* iii fr. **168). For the presence of Hera in fr. **168, see Hadjicosti (2006a: 291-301).

with mortals, and this is only conducted through intermediaries. As a result, the credibility of the scholion by Ploutarchos, in relation to the identity of the performer of the *psychostasia*, is also questioned.[24] The suspicions against the presence of Zeus are related to the fact that there is a group of vases presenting the *psychostasia* with Eos and Thetis from as early as 540 B.C.,[25] and only in one of the above cases does Zeus hold the scales (*LIMC* Eos 294);[26] in most other cases we find Hermes performing this task (*LIMC* Eos 293; 295; 297-8).

Nevertheless, Zeus is often in depictions of the *psychostasia* in iconography, even if not holding the scales, (*LIMC* Eos 293; 295; 296; 299) and the *testimonia* of both Ploutarchos and Polydeukes do not require that he does hold them. Ploutarchos only notes that the scales were those of Zeus (ταῖς πλάστιγξι τοῦ Διὸς), and this could be explained as the influence of the *Iliad*, and Polydeukes simply notes that Zeus was present (ὁ Ζεὺς καὶ οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν). Hermes could still be among the entourage of Zeus and the one holding

[24] Taplin (1977: 431-2), who doubts Ploutarchos' *testimonium* sees the influence of the *Aithiopis* on the *Psychostasia*, and not of the *Iliad*, as Ploutarchos suggests. This has also been the view of Severyns (1928: 319); Kullmann (1984: 318). The brief nature of the motif in the *Iliad* (cf. 8.69; 16.658; 22.209) and the fact that it occasionally occurs later than needed (cf. the *kerostasia* performed for Patroklos in *Il.* 16.658 after his death) caused further suspicions that a source other than the *Iliad* included it. As a result, it has been suggested by Dietrich (1964: 113-4) that the weighing was an established motif by the time of the *Iliad*, to the point where it could be used even when not determining things, perhaps by the *Aithiopis*.

[25] See *LIMC*, Eos, 293-7; Caskey and Beazley iii, (1963: 44-6, vases 1-9).

[26] The vase is a black-figure hydria from Villa Giulia (*LIMC* Eos 294/Achilleus 797) and, according to Kossatz-Deissmann *LIMC* i (1981: 173), is dated to 520-15 B.C. See, also, Caskey and Beazley, iii (1963: 45, vase 1) who believe that Aischylos found the motif in the *Aithiopis*, but suggest that the existence of the hydria presenting Zeus holding the scales should prevent us from concluding that in the *Aithiopis* it was Hermes who held the scales.

the scales. Only one vase actually presents Zeus holding the scales and this could have been the mistake of the painter, or his vivid way of involving Zeus in the weighing.

Ploutarchos, Polydeukes and the vase that presents Zeus holding the scales (*LIMC* Eos 294) point to a version of the story where the father of gods intervened, one way or another, with the weighing. The *testimonia* and the vase have different origins and come from different ages and it is quite unlikely that all three cases are influenced by the same erratic source.[27] This could imply a co-existence of the two gods at the *psychostasia*, which, under the influence of the Iliadic *kerostasia,* might have caused some confusion on the role that each had in Aischylos.

As far as we know, the scene was rarely depicted on south-Italian vases. There is, however, a volute-crater from Tarent (*LIMC* Eos 298) which presents the *psychostasia* with Hermes and both mothers. This is a vase of the late fourth century by the Ixion painter generating the suggestion that it depicts the influence of the play of Aischylos.[28] Although south-Italian vases often depict the influence of a performance and occasionally acknowledge their theatricality, there is no secure indication that the vase was influenced by a performance of the play of Aischylos, although it seems probable that its inspiration was, at least in part, theatrical, because of the fondness of south-Italian artists for theatre-related themes.

---

[27] Sourvinou-Inwood (2003: 463-4) suggests that the existence of various unrelated *testimonia* attests to Zeus' presence.

[28] Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 69). For the vase see, furthermore, Trendall (1967: 339, vase 800).

To conclude, there has been a long discussion in scholarship on whether the *psychostasia* was presented on stage or narrated in the play, and on whether the presence of Zeus would be possible on stage. The current study sides with the defenders of the narrative reconstruction, mainly because of the technical problems that they suggest. The narration of what took place on mount Olympus is a motif often found in Homer that could, with effect, be incorporated in tragedy. This could be an effort for intertextual, generic or authorial rivalry in the established epic way of predetermining events close to the time when they take place. This, of course, also has interesting implications for the naming process, since this play gets its name from one memorable incident.

The *psychostasia*, even if only narrated, would have connotations for the divine world that Aischylos presents in his corpus and it would draw attention to the divine tragedy of Eos (and Thetis). It is in this light that we should also consider the reference to Zeus' role in the *psychostasia*. The reference to Zeus, as owner of the scales (cf. Ploutarchos) or as a spectator/performer of the *psychostasia,* might also be seen to serve dramatic reasons, inspired by the *Iliad*. It has been suggested that in the *Iliad*, Zeus' inability to save Sarpedon has been adapted from the motif of the mother who stood beside the scales in the pre-Homeric tradition, unable or perhaps not allowed to help (cf. p. 192).[29] Of course, the inactivity of Zeus is fully motivated in context, and is part of a Homeric tendency, which distinguishes the poet of the *Iliad* from the cycle, to stress the

[29] Clark and Coulson (1978: 69) suggest that Zeus' momentary passivity and inability to save his son can be explained by the fact that the greatest of gods has here the function of a hero's mother confronting fate. Janko (1992: 375) suggests that Zeus shares the lot of the bereaved fathers whose grief is a *leitmotif* in the poem.

inevitability of death even for the greatest heroes.[30] Nevertheless, this is a rare moment in the *Iliad* where Zeus, the greatest of gods, is seen to be powerless. If Aischylos referred to Zeus in the *psychostasia,* this would bring to mind his powerlessness to save Sarpedon in the *Iliad.* Zeus himself has been in the same place that two lesser goddesses now are. Thus, it would work as a reminder that no god, regardless of his greatness, can avert what is destined.

Divine helplessness, as presented in the *Psychostasia* is rarely attested in tragedy. Gods in Greek drama, whether on or off stage, are powerful and usually determine things. What is more, the gods appearing on stage always have an energetic role.[31] Their presence shapes the plays in a variety of ways. This can, for example, be by causing mortals to sin, helping them with information or other aid, resolving mortal dilemmas, punishing mortals or other gods. Perhaps this is an additional reason why the *psychostasia* should not to be expected to be seen on stage.

There are, nonetheless, two cases in tragedy where gods are, at least temporarily, seen to be ineffective. Such is the case of Prometheus in the *Prometheus* and Thetis in *TrGF* iii fr. 350.[32] In both cases the gods are, or have been, unable to oppose the will or the craftiness of a more powerful god. They are seen to be weak at some point, as Prometheus is in the *Prometheus.* However, this is due to a conflict of some form with

[30] See p. 64, n. 34.

[31] Easterling (1993b: 84) suggests that gods appear in tragedy when they can shape the play.

[32] See p. 57.

another god, Zeus in this case, who on the contrary is victorious at least temporarily. In such cases, the helplessness of a god is simultaneously the prevalence of another.

The *psychostasia*, even if only narrated, appears to be a different case, however. Thetis does not prevail over the helpless Eos who is about to lose her son. Besides, the *psychostasia* has no real winner; Achilleus is to die soon after Memnon. However, this is not the usual tragedy of mortals, and with the exception of the *Prometheus*, all the plays that we know of are the tragedies of mortals. The *Psychostasia* is the tragedy of a divine mother, as much as it is the tragedy of her semi-divine son. This does not presuppose that it was at Olympus, and not at the battlefield, where the result of the battle was determined. The *psychostasia* motif could have been narrated just before or immediately after the battle, as in the case mentioned earlier of Patroklos in the *Iliad*, in order to prevent ruining the suspense of a probable battle narration.

In conclusion, Aischylos found a brief motif of *kerostasia* in the epic cycle, repeatedly depicted by contemporary art, and used this motif in his play, as a *psychostasia* this time, probably for dramatic purposes. The *psychostasia* could point to the existence of a power greater than the gods that renders them ineffective against the death of their offspring, in the same way as it renders mortals helpless. The divine mothers are as powerless as two mortal mothers would have been, and this is a moment in their personal stories, with its roots in the *Iliad*, which makes them less distant to the audience. The *psychostasia* is where divine fate meets mortal fate.

If the *psychostasia* was not presented and took place at Olympus among the gods then someone was needed to bring the news to the characters on stage. The scene could, for example, be set at Aethiopia, the homeland of Memnon with his compatriots and his mother present. Alternatively, the action could take place in the Trojan city where the allies of Memnon are waiting his return from the battlefield. Eos, in this case, could be the one bringing the news from Olympus herself, since she was present at the *psychostasia* and she could, additionally, serve as his mourner.[33] Mourning mothers are repeatedly put on stage by Aischylos (cf. *Persai*, *Kares/Europe*, *Niobe*, *TrGF* iii fr. 350) alluring to a wider pattern in literature.[34] Memnon's mother is attested to come on stage at some point of the drama, by Poll. 4.130, and she carries the corpse of her dead son:

> ἡ δὲ γέρανος μηχάνημά ἐστιν ἐκ μετεώρου καταφερόμενον ἐφ' ἁρπαγῇ σώματος, ᾧ κέχρηται Ἠὼς ἁρπάζουσα τὸ σῶμα τὸ Μέμνονος.[35]

---

[33] Weiss *LIMC* iii (1986: 784-6) suggests Aischylean influence for the vase *LIMC* Eos 325, and dates it to 430-20 B.C. For the vase, see Trendall and Cambitoglou (1978: 435, 12a). If the play of Aischylos takes place in the barbarian city, as we suspect, with Eos mourning her son at the end, then Achilleus, with Nike and Athena exalting his victory, would probably have no place in the play. This, if the connection of the vase to Aischylos was to be established, could only be the representation of something that was narrated in the play. However, although we know of no other play on the story including a *psychostasia*, there are *testimonia* for other plays with the title *Memnon* that could have influenced the vase with Eos holding her dead son in her arms. See p. 170.

[34] See pp. 190-1.

[35] Taplin (1977: 432) suggests that the fact that Eos pleaded for her son's life and also intervened with his corpse is reminiscent of the Muse in the *Rhesos*.

Although there are many doubts concerning the credibility of the *testimonium* and the use of the crane in the play,[36] it is not improbable that the body of the hero was on stage at some point and that his mother carried it away with more conventional means.[37]

Moreover, the *Psychostasia* has an interesting correspondence with the *Memnon*. In the *Psychostasia*, as in the *Memnon*, we are witnessing the waiting of the Trojans and their allies for the outcome of a battle.[38] In the *Memnon* the news bring joy, but in the *Psychostasia* it brings despair. The focus of the latter play is probably on the way in which the result of the second battle is determined at a divine level as well as in the battlefield, albeit with gods on Olympus acting only as spectators. Therefore, unlike the *Memnon*, the *Psychostasia* presents the reaction of both the gods and the Trojans for the outcome of a battle, the results of which are determined by, and have an impact on, both the human and the divine world. The *psychostasia* motif would additionally allow Aischylos the variation needed to avoid repeating himself, if he was to present two plays on the outcome of a battle with Memnon whether in a trilogy or not.

West against the authenticity of the Psychostasia

West has expressed doubts as to whether the *Psychostasia* was actually the work of Aischylos. He offers two reasons. Firstly, West, who does not accept the use of the

[36] See, moreover, pp. 207-8. Note, however, that Mastronarde (1990: 287) believes that the crane was used.

[37] The transportation of the corpse, even if only narrated, would indicate that Aischylos preferred the cyclic version of immortality to the lyric tale of the burial.

[38] For mirror-scenes, see p. 141, n. 84.

crane by Aischylos, argues that a writer without this at his disposal would not attempt to present either Sarpedon's arrival home in the *Kares/Europe*[39] or the transportation of Memnon by his mother in the *Psychostasia.*[40] So he disregards both plays as not authentic, since only someone who lived a generation or more after Aischylos could have written them. However, Polydeukes' testimony could refer to his own age, or to another play, and there is no need for us to assume that there ever was a *deus ex machina* in the original performance of the Aischylean *Psychostasia.*

Secondly, West believes that the *psychostasia* was presented; he proposes that the opening scene of the play would have been the weighing of the souls and, if so, then the prologue was spoken by three persons, the two mothers and Zeus.[41] He distinguishes this from the two types of Aischylean prologues which we find in the surviving plays: either a monologue by a servant or a functionary who makes no further appearance in the play, or a prologue by two persons who do appear later on and make plans for the subsequent action. He further considers this scene to resemble the prologue of the *Prometheus.*

It is not at all certain, though, that the *psychostasia* formed the prologue scene of the play and it is unsafe to use a highly tendentious reconstruction of the play to question its authenticity. The *psychostasia* could be narrated later (as suggested in p. 179). There are, moreover, other possibilities for the prologue of the *Psychostasia.* For example,

[39] See West (2000: 350). See pp. 207-8.

[40] West (2000: 347) suggests that the scene was a later addition to the play.

[41] West (2000: 346).

certain characters of the play could be on stage to express their fear of the reaction of Achilleus after the death of Antilochos in the *Memnon*, or they could speak of the imminent crucial confrontation of the two heroes. The chorus could do the same in the *parodos*, if there was no prologue at all.

West's argument against the authenticity of the play is, moreover, undermined by his own belief that the *Memnon* is an authentic play by Aischylos, because of certain similarities, which he notes, between the play and the *Oresteia* and the *Hiketides*; these make him suggest that it was written in Aischylos' late years.[42] West, as a result, suggests the existence of a trilogy that would include plays by two different playwrights: the *Kares/Europe* and the *Psychostasia*, both of which he does not consider Aischylean, and the *Memnon*, an original play by Aischylos.[43] This sequence of plays is a common suggestion among researchers and is discussed below. Nevertheless, though the possibility of a trilogy with plays by two different authors cannot be ruled out, there is no parallel and we have no positive evidence to support the hypothesis. The conjecture is all the more unsafe because the plays discussed are lost and their authenticity cannot be checked.

[42] West (2000: 347).

[43] West (2000: 351) names the son of Aischylos, Euphorion, as the author of the *Kares/Europe* and the *Psychostasia*. See, also, pp. 328-32.

The suggested trilogy

There is no evidence that the *Memnon* and the *Psychostasia* are part of the same trilogy.[44] It is however almost unanimously suggested by critics that three plays (a) the *Kares/Europe*,[45] (b) the *Memnon* and (c) the *Psychostasia*, formed, in that order, a connected trilogy, and this is frequently referred to as 'the Memnon trilogy'.[46] This suggestion, tentative as it may be, is often repeated. A tragedy on the death of Sarpedon is considered to come before the arrival of Memnon at Troy, simply because the death of Sarpedon occurred before the death of Memnon in the epic cycle. But in reality so did many other deaths of heroes.

After the death of Sarpedon in epos, the deaths of Patroklos and Hektor intervene before the death of Memnon and Achilleus. The death of Sarpedon is in narrative terms closely connected with the death of Patroklos and of Hektor. If the *Kares/Europe* was followed by the *Memnon* then it would be left with no conclusion and Patroklos, the hero of the first play, would have to disappear, while we would proceed to the death of Antilochos in the second play. It is difficult to see how the proposed plays, *Kares/Europe- Memnon-Psychostasia*, could form a trilogy with a causal narrative sequence. Alternative relationships between the plays that go beyond causality, such as mourning mothers for example, are highly uncertain.

---

[44] See p. 164.

[45] For the *Kares/Europe*, see pp. 187-210. For questions on its authenticity, see pp. 320-332

[46] Mette (1963: 108-12); Ferrari (1982: 155); Deforge (1986: 123); Clark and Coulson (1978); Aélion i (1983: 24); West (2000: 347).

The question is: why have researchers chosen to connect Sarpedon to the story of Memnon? The answer could be the amount of similarities between the stories of Memnon and Sarpedon. The amount of common elements led neoanalysts to attempt an explanation of how Memnon, as found in the epic cycle, was supposedly the model for Sarpedon who fights at Troy, is killed and then transferred back to his homeland in a miraculous way.[47] Irrespective of whether we believe that one story was modelled on the other in epos, there is certainly an attested fusion between the two heroes, which is made more explicit if we have a look at literature and art.

Although Sarpedon and Memnon never coexisted in the Trojan war, writers tend to mention them together (cf. Ar. *Nu.* 622: ἡνίκ' ἂν πενθῶμεν ἢ τὸν Μέμνον' ἢ Σαρπηδόνα and schol. *Nu.* 622).[48] Further evidence for the close connection between the two heroes is provided by an Attic black-figure amphora from the early fifth century (*LIMC* Eos 329),[49] which presents Hypnos and Thanatos lifting the body of Sarpedon on one side, with Eos aloft with the body of her son on the other side. Another telling piece of evidence is Pausanias' description (10.31.5) of Polygnotos' wall-painting at Delphoi, namely his *Nekyia* (c. 460 B.C.), that presents the two heroes next to each other.[50] It is

[47] Pestalozzi (1945: 13); Schadewaldt (1944: 165-6); Kakridis (1949: 95), speak of epic songs older than the *Aithiopis* and with a similar story; Schoeck (1961: 23). See, moreover, p. 192, n. 13 on traditional stories of Sarpedon at Lycia.

[48] The two heroes appear together in Sophokles *TrGF* iv fr. 210.

[49] See Weiss in *LIMC* iii (1986: 784).

[50] Stansbury-O'Donnell (1990: 227).

also symptomatic of confusion that vases that present Sarpedon carried home and have no inscriptions have often been considered to present Memnon's transportation.[51]

On the other hand, there have been suggestions that the death of Achilleus was the axis of the third play of a trilogy on Memnon.[52] There is no doubt that the death of Achilleus in the epic cycle is closely connected in narrative terms to the death of Memnon. In the *Aithiopis*, as Proklos narrates, the two deaths are interwoven and Thetis τὰ κατὰ τὸν Μέμνονα προλέγει to her son (*PEG argumentum* 12). Gantz suggested that this play on Achilleus' death would be the *Phrygioi*.[53] There is, in fact, no evidence that the plot of the supposed third play of the trilogy, including the death of Achilleus, could be accommodated under the title *Phrygioi*.[54]

Analogies with the Achilleus plays

In many ways the *Memnon* and the *Psychostasia* remind us of the last third of the *Iliad*, where once more Achilleus' closest friend is killed and the hero avenges his friend's killer. It is also reminiscent of the Aischylean trilogy on the same story, especially of the

[51] See Clark and Coulson (1978: 71), for several examples.

[52] Hermann vii (1970: 347) suggests that the *Memnon*, the *Psychostasia*, and a play about Achilleus' death comprised the trilogy in the sequence that Arktinos presented the events in the *Aithiopis*. This is followed by Gantz (1979: 220-1); Sommerstein (1996: 56-7).

[53] Gantz (1979: 220-1). The tragedy *Phrygioi* is attested in the Catalogue, but has been considered to be a misreading of another Aischylean title (*Phryges/Hektoros Lytra*) and has, therefore, occasionally been dismissed. See, for example, Cantarella (1941: 363). Ferrari (1982: 132), on the other hand, has suggested that the second title which the Catalogue attests for the *Phryges*, namely *Hektoros Lytra*, is the result of the existence of a tragedy with a title similar to *Phryges*, this being *Phrygioi*.

[54] It should be noted that Gantz (1979: 221, n. 36); (1981: 21-2), furthermore, suggests that *TrGF* iii fr. 350 belongs to the *Phrygioi* where Thetis would be lamenting Achilleus' death. For the same suggestion, see Sommerstein (1996: 56-7). For a discussion of *TrGF* iii fr. 350 as part of another play, see pp. 57-9.

first two plays, the *Myrmidones* and the *Nereides*. A basic difference would be that in the Memnon plays the audience witnesses things in the Trojan camp, whereas in the Achilleus plays the action takes place in the Achaean camp.

There would be a further difference– the relationship of Achilleus to the hero who dies and whose death causes his revenge. In the Achilleus plays the hero loses his lover, but in the *Memnon*, as far as we can tell, he loses a good friend. The relationship of Achilleus and Patroklos, as found in the *Iliad*, is closer to the relationship between Achilleus and Antilochos in the Memnon plays than to the *Achilleis*. Though we cannot be certain, it is possible that Aischylos presented the Achilleus trilogy before the *Memnon*[55] and that, having presented the loss of the lover, he returned to the theme of the two friends. Aischylos would then rival himself and with this self-referential note he invites the audience to acknowledge his creative treatment in two occasions of a motif with less diversity in epic tradition than is to be found in his corpus.

The focus, of course, in the *Memnon* would not have been the relationship of Achilleus and Antilochos, because the action takes place in the Trojan camp. This means that we would not witness a lament of Achilleus for Antilochos, although the death of the latter would have been presented as the motive of the Achaean hero in killing Memnon. Their relationship would be different from the erotic one presented in the *Myrmidones* and it would probably lack its intensity.

[55] The Achilleus plays are often considered to be early (cf. p. 99, n. 4), and there is, also, the possibility that the *Memnon* was a three-actors play, and therefore, late (cf. p. 169).

Kares/Europe

The fragments and the testimonia

The double title of the play is attested in the Catalogue. There are few fragments surviving (*TrGF* iii frs. 99-101). *TrGF* iii fragments 100-101 inform us of the name of the author and the title of the play. The former implies the war context of the play:

ἀλλ' Ἄρης φιλεῖ
ἀεὶ τὰ λῷστα πάντ' ἀπανθίζειν στρατοῦ

The latter cites the name of the Carian city Μύλασος.

TrGF iii fr. **99 has been tentatively assigned to the play by modern researchers.[1] Recently, however, West has drawn attention to certain discrepancies between *TrGF* iii fr. **99 and the rest of the surviving Aischylean corpus and, as a result, questioned the authorship of the *Kares/Europe*.[2] The current study feels that there is no reason to question the authorship of the play, though there is good reason to revive the question of the assignment of the fragment to the play. Subsequently, the discussion here is conducted both with and without the inclusion of the fragment in the play. The possibility of disengaging the authorship of the *Kares/Europe* from the assignment of *TrGF* iii fr. **99 to the play is further discussed in the appendix.[3]

---

[1] Radt (1985: 217-21) in the *TrGF* edition edits the fragment with the sign ** to denote this. For the assignment, see pp. 321-24.

[2] West (2000: 347-51).

[3] See pp. 320-32.

TrGF iii ** fr. 99

<ΕΥΡΩΠΗ·>

ταύρῳ τε λειμὼν ξένια πάμβοτος πάρα.

τοιόνδε μὲν Ζεὺς κλέμμα πρεσβύτου πατρὸς

αὐτοῦ μένων ἄμοχθον ἤνυσεν λαβεῖν.

τί οὖν; τὰ πολλὰ κεῖνα διὰ παύρων λέγω.

γυνὴ θεῷ μειχθεῖσα παρθένου σέβας

ἥμειψε, παίδων δ' ἐζύγη ξυνάονι.

καὶ τρὶς γοναῖσι τοὺς γυναικείους πόνους

ἐκαρτέρησ' ἄρουρα, κοὐκ ἐμέμψατο

τοῦ μὴ 'ξενεγκεῖν σπέρμα γενναῖον πατρός.

ἐκ τῶν μεγίστων δ' ἠρξάμην φυτευμάτων

Μίνω τεκοῦσα

* * *

Ῥαδάμανθυν, ὅσπερ ἄφθιτος παίδων ἐμῶν.

ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν αὐγαῖς ταῖς ἐμαῖς ζόη σφ' ἔχει·

τὸ μὴ παρὸν δὲ τέρψιν οὐκ ἔχει φίλοις.

τρίτον δε, τοῦ νῦν φροντίσιν χειμάζομαι,

Σαρπηδόν', αἰχμὴ μὴ 'ξ Ἄρεως καθίκετο.

κλέος γὰρ ἥκειν Ἑλλάδος λωτίσματα

πάσης, ὑπερφέροντας ἀλκίμῳ σθένει,

αὐχεῖν δὲ Τρώων ἄστυ πορθήσειν βίᾳ.

πρὸς οὗ δέδοικα μή τι μαργαίνων δόρει

ἀνυπέρβατον δράσῃ τε καὶ πάθῃ κακόν.

λεπτὴ γὰρ ἐλπὶς ἡδ' ἐπὶ ξυροῦ μένει

μή πάντα παίσασ' ἐκχέω πρὸς ἔρματι

TrGF iii fragment **99 is usually considered to come from the early part of the play.[4] The fragment seems to present the story of Europe waiting for news of her son, Sarpedon, fighting at Troy, only to find out that he is dead.[5] Her words in fr. **99 present her union with the father of the gods not as honour and blessing but as a source of unhappiness. The idea that the children of Zeus are as prone to unhappiness as anyone else is as old as Homer. Association with or descent from the gods – even the greatest god – never offered protection from suffering.[6] Europe speaks of what she considers to be her sad fate, as far as the children of this union are concerned; she cannot see Rhadamanthys, despite his immortality, and she is worried about Sarpedon's life.

Taking into account the doubts concerning the assignment of *TrGF* iii ** fr. 99 to the play, we should first consider our evidence for the *Kares/Europe* without its inclusion. The presence of Europe and the identity of the chorus are both confirmed by the title of

[4] Blass (1880: 86); Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1914: 235); Keen (2005: 67).

[5] *TrGF* iii fr. **99.1-3 offers a variant of the myth, as noted by Ferrari (1982: 96-7): Zeus waits for Europe in Crete and has her carried to him by a bull. This means that Zeus did not transform himself into a bull, as was usually the case (cf. *Gynaikon Katalogos* fr. 140).

[6] The Homeric background of this connection of misfortune to the children of gods can be seen in the cases of Sarpedon (cf. p. 192) and Achilleus (cf. *Il.* 18.50-64; 440-3) in the *Iliad.*

the play.[7] The title *Kares* is ambiguous as far as the location of the action is concerned, since it could have referred to a chorus of Carian soldiers accompanying Sarpedon to Troy or to a group of his compatriots at his homeland. It is the alternative title *Europe* which locates the play geographically in the homeland of the hero and indicates that it fell into the *nostos* pattern.[8] The tragedy would probably present a variation of the *nostos* motif, an abortive *nostos*, in which the hero actually returns dead or fails to return, and is comparable, in this respect, to Euripides' *Andromache* and, to some extent, to Sophokles' *Trachiniai.*

In a nostos *play*, Europe would probably be seen waiting for the return of her son and then lamenting his death. She would fall into a pattern began by Hekabe in Homer (*Il.* 22.430-6; 24.747-60) and continued by the mother of Polyneikes and Eteokles and the mother of Geryon in the poetry of Stesichoros (cf. pp. 193-4).[9] Her presence is comparable to that of other lamenting mothers of the Aischylean corpus such as Thetis in *TrGF* iii fr. 350[10] and Niobe in the homonymous Aischylean fragmentary play (*TrGF* iii frs. 154a-167b).[11] Thetis, Niobe and Europe all considered themselves fortunate in their children and now experience a reversal of their lives. Europe is also comparable to the

[7] One of the questions that have troubled researchers has been why the chorus of this play consists of Carians and not Lycians, who are traditionally the compatriots of the hero. See the discussion in pp. 200-6).

[8] For the theme of *nostos* in tragedy, see Taplin (1977: 83-4; 124; 302); Easterling (1982: 1). For *nostos* as a mega-theme in Homer, see Maronitis (2004: 63-76).

[9] See Loraux (1998: 35-41), for a discussion on the mourning mother motif in Homer and tragedy.

[10] See pp. 57-9.

[11] Additionally, at Lebadia there was a striking cult of Demetra-Europe (Paus. 9.39.4-5), as both were mothers in mourning.

Aischylean Persian queen, who is waiting for the return of her warrior son in agony only to witness an unprecedented reversal in her personal fate and that of her empire. Europe's presence not only exemplifies the suffering non-combatants but, through her relationship with Zeus, she reflects the inescapability of suffering even for those blessed by contact with the gods. The idea of *peripeteia* in a life which moves between supreme blessedness and supreme misery might have been important for the *Kares/Europe*.

What is significant is that Europe presents her life in a way that reminds us of Kassandra and Io. Her story, as presented in the fragment, is that of a mortal woman that has to cope with the uninvited love of an immortal and the pain that she has to endure because of attracting this divine attention. Europe is completely disillusioned in *TrGF* iii fr. **99. *TrGF* iii fr. **99, even if spurious, offers a glimpse of the way in which Europe could have contributed to the emotions and actions of the play. If the fragment is not by Aischylos, it could perhaps reflect the reception of the Aischylean play in the work of another playwright (cf. pp. 210; 331-2).

Apart from the identity of the mother and that of the chorus, there is no evidence of the identity of the other characters on stage. The play could resemble the form of the *Persai*, with the mother, the chorus and a messenger on stage for most of the play. Alternatively, another character such as Rhadamanthys, the brother of Sarpedon, or Glaukos, his cousin, could appear on stage at some point during the drama. The latter, for example, could be bringing news of the battle.

The literary material used

In the *Iliad,* Sarpedon is mentioned on several occasions as the chief of the Lycians. He is also singled out for the most powerful statement of heroic values (*Il.* 5.470-92). He slays Tlepolemos (*Il.* 5.655), is wounded in battle (*Il.* 5.660), and later he tears down the Greek battlement (*Il.* 12.397). Finally, he is slain by Patroklos (*Il.* 16.502) despite his father Zeus' effort to postpone his death (*Il.* 16.433-61). His corpse is carried to his homeland by Hypnos and Thanatos (*Il.* 16.681-3).[12] Apparently, in the *Iliad* Sarpedon was not only a great warrior but also a source of anxiety and sorrow for Zeus. Homer chose the divine parent-mortal son relationship to show how powerless even the greatest of gods was against fate and death.

It has been repeatedly suggested that Sarpedon was not traditionally a hero of the Trojan war until Homer inserted him in the story. Sarpedon was originally to be found in local stories fighting the Rhodian king Tlepolemos, at Lycia.[13] As the child of Europe and the brother of Rhadamanthys and Minos, Sarpedon traditionally lived three generations before the Trojan war. Homer, however, changed the hero's genealogy, in order to introduce him in the Trojan saga, and made him, through Laodameia, the grandson of Bellerophon.[14]

[12] Nagy (1983: 205-6), believes that this suggests an implicit immortalisation of Sarpedon in the *Iliad.*

[13] Page (1959: 148-9); Janko (1992: 371-3). Also see West (1997: 386), who notes the pre-existence of the story of an Anatolian Sarpedon before Homer uses the hero in his poetry.

[14] Janko (1992: 371).

The story that Homer created for Sarpedon in the *Iliad* ends with his death and there is only a brief reference to the return of his corpse to his homeland by Hypnos and Thanatos (16.681-3). There is no place in the epic song for elaboration on this miraculous return. This is probably a new element in the story since the hero traditionally died in Lycia and there was never before a need for transportation.[15] Therefore, one must seek other possible sources for the actual return of the body to Lycia which might have influenced the poet of the *Kares/Europe*.

Simonides wrote a poem, *Europa* (*PMG* 562), and Stesichoros wrote *Europeia* (*PMG* 195), but neither of these survives. If the lyric poets followed the version that made Europe the mother of the hero, and not that of the *Iliad*, which presented Laodameia as his mother, it is possible that these poems included the story of Sarpedon. This would mean that the lyric poets combined the un-Homeric genealogy with the Homeric story of Sarpedon fighting at Troy and being killed by Patroklos, and not of the pre-Homeric Sarpedon, who fights at Lycia and dies by the hand of Tlepolemos. There is no means of answering the question on present evidence.

That Stesichoros could indeed have presented the myth in this way is indicated by the similar motif of *TrGF* iii fr. **99 in the Lille papyrus (*PMGF* 222b), where the mother of Polyneikes and Eteokles is in distress and worries about the fate of her sons. Stesichoros, moreover, employs the lament of the mother in the case of Geryon (*SLG* S13/P. Oxy.

[15] Janko (1992: 371) suggests that Homer knew of a local saga wherein the hero was killed in Lycia and this could be the reason he invented the transportation.

2617 fr. 11).[16] Simonides, on the other hand, was well known for his threnodies (cf. *PMG* 520-30).[17]

Another source available to the poet – and one which can be evaluated with more confidence - was the *Gynaikon Katalogos*. Europe's story was presented therein and, through that, the stories of all three of her children, Minos, Rhadamanthys and Sarpedon. Only *Gynaikon Katalogos* fr. 141 survives.

. . . .]πέρησε δ' ἄρ' ἁλμυρὸν ὕδωρ
. . . .] Διὸς δμηθεῖσα δόλοισι.
τῆι δὲ μίγη φιλότητι] πατὴρ καὶ δῶρον ἔδωκεν
ὅρμον χρύσειον, τόν ῥ' Ἥ]φαιστος κλυτοτέχνης
. . . . . ἰδυί]ηισιν πραπίδεσσι
. . . . . πα]τρὶ φέρων· ὃ δὲ δέξατο δῶρο[ν·
. . . . . κού]ρ[η]ι Φοίνικος ἀγαυοῦ.
. . . . . ἔμ]ελλε τανισφύρωι Εὐρωπείηι,
. . . . . .] πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε
. . . . . νύ]μφης πάρα καλλικόμοιο. 10
ἣ δ' ἄρα παῖδ]ας [ἔτικτ]εν ὑπερμενέϊ Κρονίωνι
. . . . . πο]λέων ἡγήτορας ἀνδρῶν,

[16] See Robertson (1969: 217), for the possible influence of Stesichoros on the iconography of Geryon's story and the presence of his mother on vases.

[17] A fragment of Simonides (*PMG* 519 fr. 55.1) includes the word Λύκιον but there is no indication that it refers to Sarpedon. This could, alternatively, be a reference to Apollon Lykios.

Μίνω τε κρείοντα] δίκαιόν τε Ῥαδάμανθυν

καὶ Σαρπηδόνα δῖον] ἀμύμονά τε κρατερ[όν τε.

]ε<u>δά</u>σσατο μητίετα Ζ[εύς·

Λυκίης εὐρ]<u>ε</u>ίης ἵφι ἄνασσε

πό]λεις εὖ ναιεταώσα[ς

πολ]<u>λ</u>ὴ δέ οἱ ἔσπετο τιμή

μεγαλή]τορι ποιμένι λαῶν.

]<u>ν</u> μερόπων ἀνθρώπων 20

ἐφί]λατο μητίετα Ζεύς.

πολ]ὺν δ' ἐκρίνατο λαόν.

Τρ]ώεσσ' ἐπικούρους·

] πολέμοιο δαήμων.

ἀριστ]<u>ε</u>ρὰ σήματα φαίνων

Ζεὺς] ἄφθιτα μήδεα εἰδώς.

]ατο<u>ι</u> ἀμφιβαλοῦσαι

] Διόθεν τέ<u>ρ</u>ας ἦεν.

Ἕκτ]ορος ἀνδροφόνοιο

]<u>δ</u>ὲ <u>κή</u>δε' ἔθηκε. 30

]ς Ἀρ<u>γ</u>εί[ο]ισι·

]<u>κε</u>[

Apparently, the *Gynaikon Katalogos* as well as the *Kares/Europe* and *TrGF* iii fr. **99 differ from the *Iliad*, as far as Sarpedon's genealogy is concerned. Nevertheless, the *Gynaikon Katalogos* fr. 141, the *Kares/Europe* and *TrGF* iii fr. **99 place Sarpedon at Troy, which means that they solve the chronological problem in a different way to that followed by Homer; fr. 141.20 possibly suggests that Sarpedon lived for three generations of mortal people (μερόπων ἀνθρώπων), thus reconciling his presence at

Troy with that of Idomeneus, the grandson of his brother, Minos (cf. *Gynaikon Katalogos* fr. 204.56).[18] Apollodoros (3.1.2) also follows this. It is not clear, however, whether the poet of the *Kares/Europe* addresses this problem or not. It is quite plausible, though, to suggest that the play could have effectively avoided mentioning this element. The *Kares/Europe* resembles the *Iliad* in that Sarpedon is not simply a great warrior but also the cause of concern for his parents. So, the *Gynaikon Katalogos* and the *Iliad* might have served as possible sources of inspiration for the poet of the *Kares/Europe*.

We should turn once more to our evidence from *TrGF* iii fr. **99. The way in which *TrGF* iii fr. **99 has given a new twist to the story is made more explicit once reading it in comparison to fr. 141, which is very similar in context and structure but of a different objective. Both passages start from approximately the same point, the day at the seashore when Zeus met Europe. Fr. 141 uses flattering epithets for the bride and her family in a way that reminds one of *epithalamia*.[19] The children of this union are described in a positive way. Fr. 141 starts with Sarpedon, the youngest son, and works his way back to Minos. Other fragments show that the *Gynaikon Katalogos* elaborated on Minos' story at length, as noted by West.[20] Perhaps the *Gynaikon Katalogos* kept Minos until last

---

[18] West (1985: 122; 124) suggests that the poet does this so that the catalogue should be a unified whole. Note also that in fr. 1 the poet talks of people's longevity. Cf. Nestor in *Il.* 1.250-1, where it is noted that he lived for three generations of people. See, moreover, Miller (1994: 384-5, n. 10), who suggests that Sarpedon is used as an example of longevity in Pi. *P.* 3.112-4.

[19] See ll. 7; κού]ρ[η]ι Φοίνικος ἀγαυοῦ 8; ἔμ]ελλε τανισφύρῳ Εὐρωπείηι 10; νύ]μφης πάρα καλλικόμοιο.

[20] See West (1985: 84), for a reconstruction of the story of Minos and his children as presented in the *Gynaikon Katalogos*.

because he had a long line of descendants to mention and his story was probably happier than the stories of his two brothers, because he, at least, left offspring.

TrGF iii fr. **99, on the other hand, places Sarpedon at the end of the mother's narration, a kind of priamel, so that she can focus on his story. Europe, additionally, narrates the sad story herself, making it more emotionally charged.[21] There is also a difference in the manner in which Zeus is presented in the two fragments. In the fragment of the *Gynaikon Katalogos* he is referred to as πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, ὑπερμενέϊ Κρονίωνι and μητίετα Ζεύς. He is mentioned seven times, six of which are by name, whereas *TrGF* iii fr. **99 mentions him only as θεῷ and his children as σπέρμα γενναῖον πατρός, perhaps in an effort to minimise his importance. Moreover, in fr. **99, when the birth of the children is talked of, the pains endured by the mother are also mentioned. In the same spirit, this fragment completely omits Sarpedon's valour, while the latter is praised in fr. 141.23-31.

The poet of the *Gynaikon Katalogos* tells the story of a war hero, whereas the poet of *TrGF* iii fr. **99 tells the story of a mother in despair, who is about to receive her son dead from the battle. As with Deianeira in the *Trachiniai*, we are presented with anxiety which will give way to more suffering. This is important for our perception of the presentation of war and values in the *Gynaikon Katalogos* in contradistinction to that of *TrGF* iii fr. **99, whether by Aischylos or not.

[21] Gantz (1981: 23) notes how untraditional the presentation of Europe in *TrGF* iii fr. **99 is.

As mentioned above, there is silence in the *Iliad* concerning the details of the return of the body of Sarpedon to his homeland. There are some hints (*Il.* 16.674-5), which focus on how the Lycians would honour the hero but not on how they would lament him. It is not clear whether the return of the hero would have been mentioned in the *Gynaikon Katalogos* but, if so, the focus would probably lie on honouring the hero.[22]

Nevertheless, it is with the *Kares/Europe* that we probably come across the first securely attested attempt to present the actual return of the hero to his homeland. It is unclear whether the poet had something more to work on than the few laconic lines of the *Iliad.* Although there is no secure evidence that the play would include the transportation motif, this appears to be an indispensable element of the story from the *Iliad* onwards. Apart form the reference in the *Iliad* (16.681-3; cf. 16.454-5; 16.671-5), there is the repeated presence of the motif on vases that predate Aischylos.[23]

There is also the case of a vase by the so-called Sarpedon painter that appears to be connecting the transportation motif to a tragic play (*LIMC* Sarpedon 14). This vase is to

[22] Hirschberger (2004: 312) allows two possible explanations for l. 30 of the fragment (κήδε' ἔθηκε). According to Hirschberger, the line can either mean that the Lycians were distressed at the death of Sarpedon or that the Achaeans were distressed because of the disaster inflicted upon them by the hero. The latter reading is more probable, as it is in accordance with the heroic atmosphere of fr. 141, it coincides with the use of the expression in the *Iliad* (cf. *Il.* 21.525) and, lastly, the line is inserted between a reference to man-killing Hektor (l. 29) and a reference to the Argives (l. 31) and this implies war context more than it does lament.

[23] There are several cases of vases that present Hypnos and Thanatos transporting Sarpedon (*LIMC* Sarpedon 3-15). Some of these are dated as early as 520 B.C. (*LIMC* Sarpedon 3-5).

be discussed (cf. pp. 207-8) in relation to the suggested use of the *mechane* for the transportation of the corpse of Sarpedon on stage in a performance of the *Kares/Europe*.

The contemporary material used

The choice of a Carian chorus instead of the more predictable Lycian appears to be an Aischylean innovation. It is improbable that this was due to the poet's inability to distinguish different nations, although closeness between the two is attested.[24] There is only one other example in literature where the Carians are involved in Sarpedon's story and it postdates Aischylos. It is found in Aristoteles' *Peplos* 588.10, where the Carians co-exist with the Lycians at the burial of Sarpedon: ἀνακομισθεὶς ἐν Λυκίᾳ τῇ πατρίδι ἐτάφη, ἐπεγράφη δὲ αὐτῷ:

Κᾶρες καὶ Λύκιοι βασιλεῖς Σαρπηδόνα δῖον
Ξάνθου ἐπὶ προχοαῖς ἀενάον ἔθεσαν.

A clue to the reason why the Lycians are replaced by Carians in the *Kares/Europe* is a testimony that the poets confuse the Carians with the Lycians, in the same way as they confuse the Phrygians with the Trojans (Str. 14.3.3; 14.5.16). Is this simply coincidence, or is there a reason for substituting one nation for another? For example, the Phrygians, a contemporary nation of whom the Athenians had some knowledge, replace the long weakened Trojans in the *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra* of Aischylos. One of the reasons for Aischylos' choice could have been that he needed a nation that the Athenians would

[24] Bacon (1961: 53) suggests that whereas Aischylos sometimes makes mistakes, his information about better-known parts of the world is mostly accurate and complete. Hall (1989: 131) notes the closeness between the two nations who both spoke daughter-dialects of Luwian.

know and some recognisable oriental qualities.[25] Thus the poet transforms his Trojans into Phrygians, who accompany Priamos to retrieve his son's body in the *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra*.[26]

In the *Kares/Europe*, the Carians are chosen over the Lycians in a similar way. Robertson suggested that the former were better known in those years than the latter,[27] but this is still to be proved. It has, moreover, been suggested by Zardini, that Aischylos' choice of a Carian chorus serves political purposes related to the rapports between Athens and Caria in those years.[28] It is a fact that, as the result of Kimon's expedition to clear the coast of Persian garrisons in 469 B.C., a year before the battle of Eurymedon, both Lycia and Caria were subordinated to Athens and by 454/3 B.C. both countries appear as part of the Athenian league.[29] But since both were allies of Athens at this point, there is no obvious reason why the poet would replace one with the other. Besides, there is no evidence for the date of the play that would relate it to this. It seems more probable, therefore, that the choice of Aischylos was made to serve primarily dramatic and not political reasons.

Aischylos apparently used the Carians because he needed a chorus that would lament for Sarpedon in an abortive *nostos* play. However, the Lycians, as barbarians, could have

---

[25] See Hall (1989: 39; 69), for the gradual convergence of mythical and historical enemies in Greek consciousness.

[26] See pp. 143-5; 157-8.

[27] Robertson (1988: 112); Keen (2005: 74).

[28] Zardini (2000: 63); Keen (2005: 80).

[29] Bean (1978: 25); Bryce (1986: 103); Keen (1998: 97-99).

served this role to some extent, as well; not to mention what would have been the obvious choice to replace the Lycian men with Lycian women, who would have been even more suited for lament. The women of Lycia, in such a case, could have served both as the entourage of Europe and as a lamenting chorus with success. Such substitution would probably have been sufficient to serve dramatic reasons, such as to arouse stronger feelings among the audience.

There were many ways in which the Athenians would have come across the Carians.[30] Important, for our purpose, is the evidence from many ancient texts that the Carians were renowned in Athens of the fifth century for their mourning.[31] Although extreme lamentation is often connected in ancient Greece with the barbarians in general,[32] the Carians are repeatedly and specifically named. This distinctive quality of the Carians was certainly appropriate for a drama that seems to focus on the death of Sarpedon.[33] The replacement of Lycians by Carians should, additionally, be associated with the Aischylean trend of inserting contemporary material into mythical stories. These

---

[30] Hall (1989: 74) notes that both Carians and Lycians had taken part in the expedition against Greece at the side of the Persians and some could have arrived at Athens as prisoners of war. See Bean (1978: 24-5); Keen (1998: 87; 93-6); Bryce (1986: 103), for the participation of Lycians and Carians in the Persian forces (cf. Hdt. 7.98). Moreover, Caria was subordinated to Athens from 469 B.C. (cf. p. 198), and this could allow further cultural exchanges.

[31] Pl. *Lg.* 7.800e 2-3; Poll. 4.75.4; schol. Ar. *Ra.* 1301; 1302; Corinn. *PMG* 686; Men. (*PCG* frs. 201-3), has the title *Καρίνη* and his play was probably about one such lamenting woman. See, furthermore, Hall (1989: 44), who suggests that *Il.* 24. 720 may also allude to professional mourners of the east.

[32] Hall (1989: 44; 83; 131).

[33] Hall (1989: 131). See, moreover, (*ibid.*: 116) where Hall notes Aischylos' choice of Thracian women for the chorus of the *Threissai*, in contrast to Sophokles' choice of Salaminian sailors in the *Aias*, because the barbarian women were better suited for the laments required.

insertions can take many forms such as references to legal procedures, trends of Athens, and many more (cf. pp. 27-9).

The Carians are the barbarians, notoriously known in Athens of the fifth century for their hired lament at funerals.[34] In fact, Aischylos himself appears to be acquainted with this practice.[35] The poet was, in this way, not simply inserting a chorus of famous mourners in the story but one of contemporary mourners, familiar to the Athenians. The allusion of *Choephoroi* 733 and *Agamemnon* 979 to professional mourners working in Athens at the time of Aischylos may not only be an indication of the acquaintance of the poet with such groups, but it could also be a clue for the possible real-life models that Aischylos had in mind, when putting on stage barbarian choruses to perform extreme lamentations.

The contemporary resonance of the use of the Carians may have been taken further still, since the songs that the poet would compose for the chorus of the *Kares/Europe*, and perhaps for other barbarian lamenting choruses, would have resembled the real-life Carian mourning, thus introducing on stage sounds and practices that would have been proverbial to the Athenians.[36] This is not improbable as Aischylos has proven to be very

[34] Alexiou (1974: 10) speaks of the custom of hiring strangers to lament at funerals throughout antiquity, including classical Athens. Alexiou cites as evidence Pl. *Lg.* 800e, that refers to Carian women performing hired songs at funerals at Athens.

[35] Alexiou (1974: 10) notes that A. *Ch.* 733 (λύπη δ' ἄμισθος ἐστί σοι ξυνέμπορος) probably implies hired mourners at Athens. Garvie (1986: 245) also sees A. *Ch.* 733 as an allusion to the custom of hiring mourners at funerals, and notes a similar reference in A. *A.* 979 (ἀκέλευστος ἄμισθος ἀοιδά) and, moreover, in S. fr. 829 (ἄμισθος ὁ ξένος πορεύεται).

[36] See Hall (1996: 20) who speaks of aspects of performance in the *Persai*, which we cannot recover but that would probably have been important in the overall creation of an oriental atmosphere for the play as,

methodical in recreating an oriental atmosphere for tragedies whose action was taking place at eastern cities and required barbarian qualities, as the example of the *Persai* shows.[37] One of the devices that the poet can use in order to make the song of the barbarians sound more oriental would, for example, be the metre.[38]

There are two cases in the surviving corpus of Aischylos, where the poet puts on stage barbarian choruses lamenting, and they can be enlightening for the practices of such mourners, as far as the form, the language and intensity of the lament are concerned. Details for the actual mourning that can be found in the text of the *Persai* of 472 B.C. (ll. 1054-65), for example, suggest that the mourners are beating their breasts, pulling their hair, singing Mysian (oriental) laments, crying and tearing apart their clothes.[39] Lines 1054-65 follow:

Ξε. καὶ στέρν' ἄρασσε κἀπιβόα τὸ Μύσιον.

---

for example, the dance movements of the chorus and the accompanying music. Hall (1989: 133) gives the example of Ar. *Ra.* 1020, which refers to the movements of the chorus of the *Persai*, and of Ar. fr. 696 (*PCG*), which refers to the dancing of the chorus of the *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra.* (The fragment is cited in p. 143).

[37] See Broadhead (1960: 30 intro.), for devices that Aischylos uses to create the oriental world of the *Persai* such as the oriental dirge, the language (Greek that recalls the Ionic dialect of Asia Minor), numerous Persian names (*ibid.*: 318) and fine linen worn by women. Hall (1996: 109) notes that passages with Persian names in the *Persai* (e.g. ll. 21-32) create within Greek diction the impression of barbarian speech and notes (*ibid.*: 22), in the same spirit, the extensive use of polysyllabic compounds and ornamental epithets.

[38] See West (1982: 124), who suggests that the Ionic lyrics in the *Persai* are meant to have an exotic flavour; Hall (1996: 179) speaks of the 'orientalising' Ionic a minore of the *Persai*.

[39] Xerxes also tears his robe in the play because of his grief (ll. 468; 834-6; 847-8; 1030). See, moreover, Haldane (1965: 35-6) who sees the lamentation in the *Persai* as a *leitmotif*, sustained through words and actions of the chorus and references to their grief. The image of extreme lamentation is referred to repeatedly (ll. 120ff.; 537ff.; 939ff.) and at the end enacted before the eyes of the audience.

Χο. ἀνία ἀνία.
Ξε. καί μοι γενείου πέρθε λευκήρη τρίχα.
Χο. ἄπριγδ' ἄπριγδα μάλα γοεδνά.
Ξε. ἀύτει δ' ὀξύ. Χο. καὶ τάδ' ἔρξω.

Ξε. πέπλον δ' ἔρεικε κολπίαν ἀκμᾷ χερῶν.
Χο. ἀνία ἀνία.
Ξε. καὶ ψάλλ' ἔθειραν καὶ κατοίκτισαι στρατόν.
Χο. ἄπριγδ' ἄπριγδα μάλα γοεδνά.
Ξε. διαίνου δ' ὅσσε. Χο. τέγγομαί τοι.

Of even greater detail appear to be the descriptions of the barbarian lament as found in the *Choephoroi* of 458 B.C. The chorus of the barbarian female captives is informative of the extremity of their mourning on two occasions.

(ll. 22-31):

ἰαλτὸς ἐκ δόμων ἔβαν
χοὰς προπομποῦσ' ὀξύχειρι σὺν κόπῳ.
πρέπει παρῆς φοίνισσ' ἀμυγ-
μοῖς ὄνυχος ἄλοκι νεοτόμῳ,
δι' αἰῶνος δ' ἰυγ-
μοῖσι βόσκεται κέαρ,
λινοφθόροι δ' ὑφασμάτων
λακίδες ἔφλαδον ὑπ' ἄλγεσιν,
πρόστερνοι στολμοὶ πέπλων ἀγελάστοις
ξυμφοραῖς πεπληγμένων.

(ll. 423-8):

ἔκοψα κομμὸν Ἄριον ἔν τε Κισσίας
νόμοις ἰηλεμιστρίας·

ἀπρικτόπληκτα πολυπάλακτα δ' ἦν ἰδεῖν
ἐπασσυτεροτριβῆ τὰ χερὸς ὀρέγματα
ἄνωθεν ἀνέκαθεν, κτύπῳ δ' ἐπερρόθει
κροτητὸν ἀμὸν καὶ πανάθλιον κάρα.

In the *Choephoroi*, a play on a mythical story, a barbarian chorus is lamenting for Greeks, as in the *Iliad* the barbarian Briseis laments for Patroklos (19.282-300). On the contrary, in the *Persai* and the *Kares/Europe* all characters are barbarians and the action takes place in a barbarian city. In both cases, the chorus is formed by males and both choruses meet the queen on stage and, plausibly, share her agony while waiting for the return of their king from a critical battle. Perhaps the members of the chorus of the *Kares/Europe* were non-combatant aged men, as the members of the choruses of the *Persai* and the *Agamemnon* were. This could have been the reason for not following Sarpedon to war.

There is, of course, at first sight, an important difference and that is that the barbarians of the *Persai* are historical characters, whereas the barbarians of the *Kares/Europe* are mythical. Nevertheless, it appears that Aischylos went to trouble to make the chorus of the latter play as contemporary and as real-life, as possible. He did this, plausibly, using their contemporary lament as a point of reference. This is important, especially in view of the belief that it was Aischylos, who first created the combination of mythical and historical barbarian and invested this imaginary creation of his with qualities that he considered appropriate, these being, for example, wealth, effeminacy and, of course,

extreme lamentation.[40] One of the sources of Aischylos, in shaping the barbarian profile, especially as far as lamentation habits were concerned, would have been his own experience as a citizen of fifth- century Athens. He appears to have used this experience repeatedly in his plays (cf. *Choephoroi*, *Persai*, *Kares/Europe*). At least in one occasion, the *Kares/Europe,* Aischylos actually put on stage the contemporary mourners of Athens with the pretext that they were replacing a neighbouring nation, ignoring the barbarian origin of the Lycians that would have made them also capable of strong lamentation.

The insertion of the Carian chorus in the play is significant for several reasons, when examining the dramatic technique of Aischylos. Firstly, because it shows once more that the poet occasionally drew his inspiration from contemporary real-life practices. Additionally, because this would be an interesting combination of mythical and contemporary elements that could have been a fresh note to the story in that the, otherwise distant, mythical hero was given a contemporary chorus to lament him. This could, in effect, make Sarpedon and his death more recognisable to the audience of Aischylos. Thus, it would perhaps allow the Athenians to associate the loss of Europe, as sung by the Carian mourners on stage, with their own personal losses, often sung by similar Carian mourners at funerals, plausibly with analogous music and wording. This would plausibly engage them emotionally.

[40] Hall (1989: 121-33).

The transportation of Sarpedon and the use of the mechane

An Apulian bell-crater (*LIMC* Sarpedon 14), dated to the first quarter of the fourth century, has been repeatedly connected to the *Kares/Europe* of Aischylos.[41] The image of the vase displays the homecoming of Sarpedon in a rich theatrical setting on one side, with Europe in eastern garb, sitting on an elaborate throne in a stage building, while two men look towards the direction of Hypnos and Thanatos, who approach flying and bring Sarpedon. The vase is believed to have been influenced by a performance of the *Kares/Europe*.[42]

Moreover, the fact that Hypnos and Thanatos are presented flying on the vase has caused suggestions that the *mechane* was used in the transportation scene of the *Kares/Europe*.[43] This raises the question of whether Aischylos had the technical capacity to present a *deus ex machina*. Taplin is reluctant to accept the use of the *mechane* even in the later fifth century and states that the device was never used in Aischylos.[44] As for the tragedy in question, he suggests that there is no reason to believe that the body of Sarpedon would reach the stage by flying.[45] This is attested by Polydeukes for the body of Memnon in the

---

[41] Trendall and Webster (1971: 52) and Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 66, K9) suggest a date between 400-380 B.C.; Robertson (1988: 111-2) dates the vase late to the 380s B.C.; Keen (2005: 69).

[42] Trendall and Webster (1971: 53); Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 67; 74); Robertson (1988: 112); Keen (2005: 69).

[43] Trendall and Webster (1971: 52); Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 73-4); Robertson (1988: 112). For reservations concerning the use of the *mechane* in this case, see Pickard-Cambridge (1946: 100).

[44] Taplin (1977: 444-5). Taplin notes that Okeanos in the *Prometheus* is the only occasion in the whole of the surviving Aischylean corpus that is difficult to explain without the use of the *mechane*: Taplin, like many others, doubts the authenticity of the *Prometheus*. See also Silk (2000: 329, nn. 71-2), who suggests that the *mechane* was available to, and used by, the tragedians of the late fifth century.

[45] Taplin (1977: 446, n. 2).

Psychostasia (4.130), but again it is doubtful whether this was the case in the original performance of the play.[46]

Although the vase might be acknowledging its theatricality,[47] this does not necessarily mean that the divine transportation would have been enacted in actual performance in the exact mode that the painter depicted it on his image. Hypnos and Thanatos did not have to arrive on stage flying, as is the case on the vase, when this could have been simply narrated in the play. Occasionally vase painters can turn narrative, as found in dramas, into action on vases.[48] Besides, neither of the two distinct possibilities, narrative and action, need be represented literally on the vase.

A last note should be made concerning the image on the other side of the vase, which has caused some disagreement. There have been suggestions that the image depicts Europe pleading with Zeus for the life of Sarpedon.[49] On the other hand, others see the image to depict Thetis visiting Hephaistos.[50] The image is, therefore, of questionable value for any reconstruction of the *Kares*.

---

[46] See Csapo and Slater (1995: 393), who suggest that the research of Polydeukes was not original, but based on the writings of Hellenistic scholars and is, therefore, more informative for Hellenistic rather than classical theatre.

[47] For the difference between South Italian vases that acknowledge their theatricality and Attic vases that do not, see pp. 23-4.

[48] See pp. 25-6.

[49] According to Von Bothmer (1981: 69); Trendall and Webster (1971: 52); Keen (2005: 70), Europe is depicted pleading with Zeus, while Hera, who is also present, turns her head the other way in denial of the pleas.

[50] Kossatz-Deissmann (1978: 72).

A victory statue for the Kares/Europe?

Robertson suggests another case of influence of the *Kares/Europe* on contemporary art and attempts to date the play based on this. Robertson sees a resemblance between the well-preserved woman in a mantle,[51] supposed to be Europe, on an Attic cup, dated to 425 B.C.,[52] (*LIMC* Sarpedon 12), and the statue of a woman, known only in copies of the Roman period, which are widely accepted as deriving from an early classical Greek prototype (*LIMC* Europe 1).[53] Robertson noticed an inscription *Europe* on a headless marble statuette of the type (*LIMC* Europe 1a) and believes that this refers to the original Greek as well.[54] Robertson is convinced that, if the statue was copied on the Greek vase (*LIMC* Sarpedon 12), then it almost certainly stood in Athens.[55] Robertson considers the statue to have been erected in memory of an Aischylean victory with the tragedy *Kares/Europe* and, as a result, he suggests, on the basis of Aischylos' lifetime, that the original statue should be dated to the second quarter of the fifth century B.C.[56] He considers the victory of the *Kares/Europe* to be dated a few years earlier than 460 B.C.[57]

---

[51] It should be noted, however, that the mantle was often used in the theatre as a means of expressing one's grief, as by Achilleus in the *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra*. Séchan (1926: 11-6), notes the existence of the motif of a mourning person in mantle on vases before Aischylean tragedy.

[52] Robertson (1987: 40-1) dates the vase to the third or last quarter of the fifth century.

[53] Robertson (1988: 114).

[54] Harrison (1976: 140), who provided additional evidence for this, identified a woman in a mantle, to whom Minos shows the dead head of Minotauros, as Europe. Another representation of Europe in a mantle can be seen on an Attic red-figure calyx-crater of around 400 B.C., depicting Herakles with the Cretan bull as Europe stands watching (*LIMC* Europe 218).

[55] Robertson (1975: 193) and (1988: 114).

[56] Robertson (1975: 193) and (1988: 114).

[57] Robertson (1975: 193) and (1988: 114).

This, however, is not a secure verdict. The actual *terminus ante quem* for such a play, if the vase reflects a dramatic victory, should be 425 B.C., as its suggested date would indicate. If the play that it recalls is the *Kares/Europe*, then the vase might be related to a revival of the play and not to the original performance, which would have taken place many years before 425 B.C.[58] Alternatively, if *TrGF* iii fr. **99 was to be conclusively removed from the Aischylean corpus, then this would point to another poet working on the same story and, as a result, the vase, and its suggested prototype, could alternatively reflect a victory of another play by the poet of *TrGF* iii fr. **99, and not necessarily of the *Kares/Europe* of Aischylos.

[58] See pp. 313-4.

Philoktetes

The story of Philoktetes

The story of Philoktetes spans the Trojan war and almost spans the epic cycle. The *Kypria*, according to the summary by Proklos (*PEG argumentum* 50-1), speaks of Philoktetes' abandonment:

> ἔπειτα καταπλέουσιν εἰς Τένεδον. καὶ εὐωχουμένων αὐτῶν Φιλοκτήτης ὑφ' ὕδρου πληγεὶς διὰ τὴν δυσοσμίαν ἐν Λήμνῳ κατελείφθη.

His story was completed in the *Little Iliad*, which told of the embassy at Lemnos to induce him to rejoin the army, his return to Troy and the healing of his wound, and his killing of Paris. Proklos' summary gives us a few details (*PEG argumentum* 6-8):

> μετὰ ταῦτα Ὀδυσσεὺς λοχήσας Ἕλενον λαμβάνει, καὶ χρήσαντος περὶ τῆς ἁλώσεως τοῦτου Διομήδης ἐκ Λήμνου Φιλοκτήτην ἀνάγει. ἰαθεὶς δὲ οὗτος ὑπὸ Μαχάονος καὶ μονομαχήσας Ἀλεξάνδρῳ κτείνει.

The verb ἀνάγει used in this occasion does not imply force, and Diomedes could simply have accompanied Philoktetes to Troy. The role of Diomedes, rather than that of Odysseus as in later literature, probably points to an approach in which persuasion required only appeal to heroic values, or to group loyalty, based not on deception but achieved through a soldier-to-soldier approach.[1]

[1] It should also be noted that Diomedes is never among the figures accused of the abandonment in later literature.

Moreover, the *Iliou Persis* (cf. *PEG testimonium* 2) tells of Philoktetes' deeds following his rejoining the army. His former misadventure could have been mentioned; nevertheless it is doubtful whether any kind of hatred between him and the army would have been referred to, since now he was fighting at their side. It is not improbable that everything would be attributed to the Fates (cf. Q.S. 9.414-6).[2]

In narrating the absence of Philoktetes from the army in the *Iliad* (2.718-25), Homer apparently alludes to a well-known story and does not elaborate.[3] In combination with some of the scholia on the passage, we know that during the expedition to Troy, Philoktetes led the Achaeans to the altar of Chryse -some say in Tenedos, others in the island of Chryse- and, either during a sacrifice or in the middle of a feast, the hero was bitten by a water-snake and the Achaeans left him there. There are no traces of individual responsibility, and although Philoktetes is in physical pain, no bitterness against the Achaeans is mentioned. It is possible that the poet knew of no hard feelings between individuals and Philoktetes or that he ignored them.[4] A small reference to the hero is also found in the *Odyssey* (8.220), where Odysseus says that Philoktetes was the only man better than him in archery. The scholia on *Od*yssey 8.220 suggest that the poet knew of the return of the hero from Lemnos. However, the versions in the *Iliad*

[2] In the last lines of Sophokles' *Philoktetes*, there are allusions to *Moira* (l. 1466) and *tychas* (l. 1418) and their role in the story of the hero. See, moreover, the reference in Pi. *P.* 1.55 to *moiridion.*

[3] Note that Kirk (1985: 233) suggests that Zenodotos wrongly athetized *Il.* 2.724-5 -the lines point to the future return of Philoktetes to battle.

[4] Severyns (1928: 299-300) suggests that writers in Aristarchos' circle believed that Philoktetes stayed in Lemnos of his own free will, because he could there find the medicine that he needed for his wound. This could be an alternative tradition, although there is no secure evidence.

and the *Odyssey* are so brief that they allow no room for elaboration, and therefore the silence is not necessarily significant. In conclusion, the scarce evidence that we have does not allow us to detect personal guilt on the part of any individual in relation to the abandonment or indications of hard feelings. In Proklos' account of the *Little Iliad*, where Diomedes is the one sent to Lemnos, the issue of whether there was any personal hostility between Odysseus and Philoktetes is left open.

Lyric poetry also worked on the story of the abandonment. Pindar (*P.* 1.50-55), in an ode written to celebrate the victory of Hieron at the chariot-race of the Pythian games of 470 B.C.,[5] knows the story of the recall of the wounded hero from Lemnos. According to Pindar, godlike heroes went there to fetch Philoktetes and were perhaps forced to fawn upon him as a friend: σὺν δ' ἀνάγκᾳ νιν φίλον / καί τις ἐὼν μεγαλάνωρ ἔσανεν (*P.* 1.51-2).[6] In this treatment there might be elements of what is to be found in tragedy, specifically the need to persuade the hero to some extent. Although there is some form of persuasion needed in Pindar, nothing points to deception. Bakkhylides is attested as having written on the story of Philoktetes in his dithyrambs (schol. Pi. *P.* 9.100/B. fr. 7). In Bakkhylides the Greeks sent for the hero after an oracle of Helenos that the weapons of Herakles were needed for the fall of Troy. Not many details can be extracted from the lyric versions and one cannot conjecture how close to the epic story these versions were.

[5] Burton (1962: 91); Snell and Maehler (1987: 50).

[6] Burton (1962: 102) suggests that the line implies former adversaries of Hieron, who would now be begging for his help. Kirkwood (1982: 135) suggests that no specific analogy is required at this point between Hieron and Philoktetes, other than the fact that they are both needed to help.

Notes of an ancient reader on the Philoktetes

Part of the argument of the play has been preserved for us by an ancient reader, Dion. The fifty-second discourse of Dion is a comparison between the tragedies on Philoktetes by the three great tragedians. Dion notes that the story in all three tragedies revolved around the seizure of Philoktetes' weapons by Odysseus and his partly willing, partly unwilling, transfer to Troy (52.2), and then proceeds to a closer comparison among the plays in question. From Dion's reference to the plot of the play of Aischylos the following is made clear:

-Odysseus, presented as shrewd and crafty, was the one who came to persuade the hero to go to Troy (52.5).

-Odysseus was not changed in any way by Athena, as was the case in Euripides but nevertheless he was not recognised by Philoktetes (52.5). Apparently, Aischylos does not offer any explanation for this and Dion tries to explain logically why Philoktetes would not recognise Odysseus (52.6). (Presumably Aischylos leaves the reader to infer change of apperance through ageing.) This element of the plot indicates the need for Odysseus not to be recognised, implying apparently an enmity that would not allow him to approach Philoktetes. This enmity, which is not attested for any other text before Aischylos' play, could be inserted in the play, for example, through a speech of Odysseus.

-The chorus, consisted of Lemnians, was introduced in a simple way and without any explanation of whether it was the first time they had met Philoktetes or not (52.7).

-Philoktetes narrated his misfortunes to the chorus (52.9). Dion has to suppose that the inhabitants of the island had helped the hero during the previous years (52.8) and points

out that the fact that Philoktetes narrates his story to the Lemnians does not imply that it was the first time he had ever met them (52.9).[7]

-Odysseus lied to Philoktetes by claiming that the Achaeans had met with disaster, that Agamemnon was dead, that Odysseus had been charged with a disgraceful act and that the expedition had gone to ruin (52.10). Apparently, this information was designed to delight Philoktetes and this again points to hostility for Agamemnon and Odysseus specifically. Unfortunately, Dion's account is cut off rather abruptly as he proceeds to Euripides' tragedy, and we cannot follow the plot to the end.

Dion, however, chooses to present the lies of Odysseus as a simpler deception than that conveyed in Sophokles and Euripides, and he believes that the arguments used by Odysseus to persuade Philoktetes were more becoming to heroes than any kind of craft (52.9-10):

> καὶ μὴν ἡ ἀπάτη ἡ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως πρὸς τὸν Φιλοκτήτην καὶ οἱ λόγοι δι' ὧν προσηγάγετο αὐτόν, οὐ μόνον εὐσχημονέστεροι καὶ ἥρῳ πρέποντες, ἀλλ' οὐκ Εὐρυβάτου ἢ Παταικίωνος, ἀλλ', ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκοῦσι, καὶ πιθανώτεροι.

This is a rather unconvincing effort on Dion's part to vindicate the deceit of Odysseus by presenting it as becoming to heroes. Was there perhaps something about Odysseus' self-justification (for instance, a statement of reluctance to deceive) which made this approach to Philoktetes more palatable? It is difficult to draw conclusions. Though it is conceivable that the discovery of the text would allow us to understand Dion's

[7] See the discussion in Waldock (1951: 92-4) on Oidipous' failure to ask about Laios over the years, noted by Aristoteles.

contradistinction between the two kinds of deceit, one that is becoming to heroes and one that is not, it is also possible that Dion is not objective in his effort to present the behaviour of the Aischylean Odysseus as honourable; he is motivated as much by his own sense of the difference between Aischylos and his successors as by any objective feature in the text. It may be that Dion is influenced by the reception and the reputation of Aischylos and his fellow dramatists in his own age; certain stereotypes for the three great tragedians were already established in the years of Aristophanes (cf. *Ra.* 1008-17), for example.[8] It should be taken into account, when evaluating the information in Dion's discourse, that the comparative treatment of the plays in this passage could have dictated, to some extent, his approach. Characters are better defined through contrast and this could have accentuated any existing disparity between the plays.

Dion, in the same spirit, praises the Aischylean play for presenting a different quality of people, which his own age lacks and, as a result, a very dignified version of the story. Dion (52.4-5) writes:

> ἥ τε γὰρ τοῦ Αἰσχύλου μεγαλοφροσύνη καὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον, ἔτι δὲ τὸ αὔθαδες τῆς διανοίας καὶ φράσεως, πρέποντα ἐφαίνετο τραγῳδίᾳ καὶ τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἤθεσι τῶν ἡρώων, οὐδ' ἐνῆν τι βεβουλευμένον οὐδὲ στωμύλον οὐδὲ ταπεινόν· ἐπεί τοι καὶ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα εἰσῆγε δριμὺν καὶ δόλιον, ὡς ἐν τοῖς τότε, πολὺ

[8] The counter-example of Sophokles could be of some use at this point. Dion gives a rather accurate summary of Sophokles' *Philoktetes* (52.15-7), praising the play for its sweetness and the *ethos* of the characters. What might be a little surprising is the comparison between the Euripidean and the Sophoklean Odysseus (52.16): τά τε ἤθη θαυμαστῶς σεμνὰ καὶ ἐλευθέρια, τό τε τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως πολὺ πρᾳότερον καὶ ἁπλούστερον ἢ πεποίηκεν ὁ Εὐριπίδης. Perhaps the Euripidean Odysseus was so bad that by comparison all other cases appeared better, though it is more likely that Dion was influenced by inherited stereotyping of the tragedians.

δὲ ἀπέχοντα τῆς νῦν κακοηθείας, ὥστε τῷ ὄντι ἀρχαῖον ἂν δόξαι παρὰ τοὺς νῦν ἁπλοῦς εἶναι βουλομένους καὶ μεγαλόφρονας.

The fragments

The play is attested in the Catalogue and a small number of fragments survives (*TrGF* iii frs. 249-257), the largest of which consists of three lines.[9] Based on the account of Dion, it is evident that the play takes place at Lemnos where the wounded hero was abandoned.[10] *TrGF* iii fr. 249 implies that the hero addressed the river Spercheios, apostrophising his homeland:

<ΦΙΛ.>
Σπερχειὲ ποταμὲ βούνομοί τ' ἐπιστροφαί

The hero talked of the incident with the snake in *TrGF* iii fr. *252:

ΦΙΛ.
οὐ (γὰρ) ὁ δράκων ἀνῆκεν, ἀλλ' ἐνῴκισεν
δεινὴν † στομάτων † ἔμφυσιν, ποδὸς βλάβην

TrGF iii fr. 253 was part of a scene that presented Philoktetes' spasms of pain:

ΦΙΛ.
φαγέδαινα<·>, ἥ μου σάρκας ἐσθίει ποδός

[9] Milani (1879: 31-2) and Avezzù (1988: 102) repeat the idea of Welcker iii (1839: 1487) that the title *Lemnioi* of the catalogue corresponds to the play mentioned by Dion as the *Philoktetes*, and that the *Philoktetes* of the catalogue is a *Philoktetes ho en Troiai*. There is no evidence to support this view, however.

[10] See Müller (2000: 42-64), for a suggested reconstruction of the play.

Sophokles in the *Philoktetes* also uses the image of the wound/disease as a devouring creature (l. 313; cf. Euripides *TrGF* v fr. 792).

From the same scene probably comes *TrGF* iii fr. **254:

ΦΙΛ. ὦ πούς, ἀφήσω σε;

TrGF iii fr. *255 is an invocation to death:

<ΦΙΛ.>
ὦ θάνατε παιών, μή μ' ἀτιμάσῃς μολεῖν·
μόνος <γὰρ> εἶ σὺ τῶν ἀνηκέστων κακῶν
ἰατρός, ἄλγος δ' οὐδὲν ἅπτεται νεκροῦ

TrGF iii fr. 251 refers to the bow:

κρεμάσας <> τόξον πίτυος ἐκ μελανδρύου

Apparently, at some point of the action somebody hung the bow from a tree. If the bow is, at some point, not in Philoktetes' hands, then this allows the possibility for Odysseus to seize it. The scholia on *Odyssey* 14.12 preserved the feminine participle, but this is opposed by Eustathios, who offered the masculine. The feminine participle would imply the presence of either a woman or a goddess who hung the bow on the tree. Calder believes that a third character is actually needed in the play to explain the truth to Philoktetes and he believes that this should be a goddess.[11] The presence of Athena

[11] Calder (1970: 172).

has sometimes been considered probable.[12] Nevertheless, as Radt suggests, a disputed feminine participle is not enough to attest her physical presence in performance.[13]

TrGF iii fr. *250 is probably a reference to Lemnos:

ΦΙΛ.
ἔνθ' οὔτε μίμνειν ἄνεμος οὔτ' ἐκπλεῖν ἐᾷ

Lastly, *TrGF* iii fragments 255a-257 are simply of lexicographical interest.

Papyrology had nothing to present on the *Philoktetes* of Aischylos until 1952, when Lobel identified P. Oxy. 2256 fr. 5 as the *hypothesis* of a *Philoktetes* (*TrGF* iii **451w).[14]

(a)		(b)
] .αδυνα		. . .
] .ληφθη		].
ἔπε]μπον		]τον
	Φ]ιλ[οκ]τ[η]	]αυ
	π]αρ' Εὐρι-	4]ενο
πίδῃ	Νέο]πτολεμ°].	].
	]Φιλοκτη	]. .
	Ὀδυσ]σευς	]
	]	. . .
	]	
	]ω οὖ	
	. . .	

[12] Welcker iii (1973: 183ff.); Hermann iii (1970: 121). On the other hand, Aélion i (1983: 64-5) writes against her intervention in this tragedy in general.

[13] See the edition by Radt (1985: 355), for all suggestions, and note that Radt prints the masculine participle. It should also be noted that the tragedy is considered by many to have been performed with two actors; see Jebb (1898: 15 intro.); Kiefer (1942: 39); Aélion i (1983: 61); Luzatto (1983: 202); Kamerbeek (1980: 2). However, on the existing evidence, no conclusion can be reached on the number of the actors.

[14] Lobel (1952: 32).

Lobel read lines 6-8, where the names of Neoptolemos, Philoktetes and Odysseus are mentioned in that order, as the catalogue of characters of the play in question.[15] This new evidence persuaded researchers of the presence of Neoptolemos in the play,[16] until an article by Kossyphopoulou proved that the names were part of a continuous text and not of a catalogue.[17] The lines in question probably consisted of a comparison of the three plays, noting among others a parallel between Aischylos and Euripides: the fact that Neoptolemos does not take part in the play and Odysseus has the same role. The proposed reconstruction of these lines by Kossyphopoulou proves that Neoptolemos is an innovation of Sophokles,[18] as Dion also attests (52.15).

Furthermore, there have been suggestions that Aischylos' *TrGF* iii fr. **451q could come from this play.[19] The subject of this choral fragment, which is 18 lines long, is the death of Aias as a result of the award of Achilleus' weapons. Although initially the fragment was considered to be part of some other tragedy (cf. pp. 50-2), it was pointed out by Snell that *TrGF* iii fr. **451q.16 starts with a *hosper* when speaking of Aias' suicide. Lloyd-Jones, who considers the whole fragment to be a summary account of the end of Aias, suggests that it was probably cited as a parallel to Philoktetes' wish to

---

[15] Lobel (1952: 32).

[16] Snell (1953: 439); Kakridis (1958: 142); Mette (1955: 400-1).

[17] Kossyphopoulou (1955: 449-51). For this short-lived heresy that ended with the article by Kossyphopoulou, see Ferrari (1982: 89-91) and Calder (1970: 171).

[18] Kossyphopoulou (1955: 451) edits ll. 5-8 of *TrGF* iii ** fr. 451w as follows: ὡς δὲ π]αρ' Εὐρι- / πίδηι οὐ συνεργεῖ Νεο]πτόλεμο(ς), / ἀλλὰ λόγοις ἐξαπατήσας] Φιλοκτή(την) / ἀνάγει μόνος εἰς Τροίαν Ὀδυσ]σεύς.

[19] Kakridis (1958: 141-5); Lloyd-Jones (1963: 584-6); Avezzù (1988: 105). Note, however, that Winnington-Ingram (1959: 241), reserves doubts concerning the assignment.

die (cf. *TrGF* iii fr. *255 on death as the only doctor).[20] This could, perhaps, be a choral response to this desire or to an act contemplated as a result of this desire. There have also been attempts to assign more papyrological fragments to the *Philoktetes*, but the evidence remains poor.[21]

Literary material

What Aischylos does to create dramatic conflict is to present Odysseus (and not Diomedes) as the emissary to Lemnos. This way he creates a crisis. Philoktetes is put in a complicated position; he hates Odysseus so much that he cannot accept the oracle and go happily to Troy where he will be cured. This would be to submit to a hated man, to an enemy. This would be a humiliation, and therefore unacceptable to anyone living within the heroic code or even motivated by considerations of honour. A requirement in order to preserve your honour, according to the heroic code, was taking revenge on your enemies.[22] The attitude of the Sophoklean Philoktetes can be enlightening in this respect: Philoktetes' hatred for Odysseus is what creates a bond between him and Neoptolemos (ll. 585-6) and his quest for revenge is considered to be a just one (ll. 1035-6).[23]

---

[20] Lloyd-Jones (1963: 584).

[21] See, for example, Görschen-Flensburg (1955: 200-6). Some of the fragments suggested are edited by Radt (1985: 492-3) as *dubia* (*TrGF* iii fr. **451s 84; 88; 89), and they might include a reference to Chryse (*TrGF* iii fr. **451s 88.1). However, the fragments are short, and could perhaps belong to another play where the story was briefly mentioned.

[22] Blundell (1989: 55).

[23] Blundell (1989: 196-7).

Odysseus, on the other hand, is also in a very awkward position. He would be aware of his responsibility for the abandonment and of the hatred of Philoktetes (the lie that Odysseus had been charged with a disgraceful act, noted in Dion 52.10, which is apparently meant to please Philoktetes, points to personal responsibility), and still he would be obliged in the best interests of the expedition to meet him and persuade him or force him, if needed, to rejoin the army. This could even be dangerous because the man whom the Achaeans left behind was a strong warrior with the weapons of a god at his disposal. It is this face-to-face collision between the two heroes, under the pressure of the collective's needs that newly determines the story.

The poet creates a hero who refuses to help his former friends and an emissary who talks him into submitting to such a request; this is reminiscent of the embassy scene in the *Iliad* (Book 9).[24] The motif of a hero who feels bitterness, because of the behaviour of his companions, and refuses to return to battle, even against the interests of his people, is a theme elaborated in the *Iliad* and in epos in general (cf. the story of Meleagros in *Minyas PEG* frs. 1-7). Philoktetes is alienated by his own people like Achilleus and Meleagros, and then recalled by them in a time of need. At least initially, he denies the recall, as the others do.

The elaboration of the motif of an embassy to bring a reluctant hero into the war is the second theme that recalls the *Iliad*, even though the idea of heroes persuading him to return was presented in this period outside tragedy (cf. Pi. *P.* 1.52). The embassies in

[24] See Beye (1970: 63-75).

the *Iliad* are in both cases addressed to someone who is desperately needed (Achilleus 9.182-657 and Meleagros 9.529-99). The ambassadors, who are always persons highly respected by the hero, are trying to persuade him. They offer gifts to achieve their goal but the gifts are rejected. The hero sends the ambassadors away and submits to their claim for his own reasons, later on and after many losses. In Aischylos' *Philoktetes*, the hero is essential for the fall of Troy. The ambassador, on the other hand, is someone who is so hated by the hero that he cannot even afford to be recognised. This may have been an interesting variation of the traditional embassy motif. This would be to some extent comparable to the silence of Achilleus in the *Myrmidones* (pp. 101-2).

Contemporary material

We should also examine the possibility that an additional source of inspiration for the poet was, as in other cases, contemporary experience. The paucity of our evidence for the play would not allow us to make specific suggestions for the convergence of myth and reality as, for example, in the cases of the *Palamedes* and the *Myrmidones*, where the epic kings are given certain characteristics of fifth-century generals and politicians. Nevertheless, the outline of the Aischylean story on Philoktetes, as far as it can be retrieved from the fragments and the *testimonia*, resembles to some extent the story of an exile or an ostracised politician in Athens of the fifth century. It is a fact that the city at the time suffered a flurry of ostracisms (cf. p. 258), but this is not enough to connect the play to fifth-century reality. The fact that Aischylos used clear references to fifth-century Athens in other occasions, such as the Areopagos in the *Oresteia*, is indicative but not conclusive evidence, either, that he would have handled the story of Philoktetes

in the same way. We would suggest, however, that the crucial innovation that Aischylos brings to the epic story- the insertion of Odysseus in a new role- might imply that we can see the episode clearer with fifth-century eyes.

To the epic story of abandonment with no hard feelings, no personal guilt and the simple recall with no man-to-man collision, Aischylos contrasts a story of civil stife: a personal collision of two leading generals which endangers the collective's common cause and national safety in a time of war. To make the patriotic choice required of him, Philoktetes must put aside his personal resentment for a domestic enemy who is responsible for his former rejection by the community. Naturally, Odysseus would argue in favour of the patriotic choice (Dion suggests that his arguments are becoming to heroes in 52.9-10).

Let us examine the parallel more closely, before reaching our conclusions. The story of Philoktetes, from the epic cycle onwards, would in many ways resemble the story of an exile and, in fact, in fifth-century Athens it would rather resemble that of an ostracised.[25] Ostracism had certain determining differences from other penalties against Athenian citizens that make it more applicable to the case of Philoktetes.

[25] See Burstein (1971: 99-102) for the terminology used in accounts of recalls from exile or ostracism. The word used for the action of bringing back from exile in Athens is often, according to Burstein, κατάγειν (Hdt. 3.138.3; 6.40.2; 6.75.1; Th. 4.74.2; 8.53.1). A similar word is used for Philoktetes in the summary of Proklos for the *Little Iliad*: Διομήδης ἐκ Λήμνου Φιλοκτήτην ἀνάγει (cf. p. 211).

Ostracism was a fixed-term exile of ten years.[26] It was used against potential enemies of the state (Aristoteles connects it initially with the friends of the tyrants in *Ath.* 22).[27] The ostracism procedure involved no speeches of accusation and there was no specific accuser or even an explicit charge. There was no defence either for potential victims. The ostracised would have to serve the ten-year period away from Athens and, following this, the victim could return to the city with both his property and reputation intact.[28] There are the following points of reference between ostracism and the story of Philoktetes: the hero was never accused for a specific reason, he was never put to trial and was never found guilty. One way or another, he was considered to be potentially obstructive of the common cause, and there is no indication that he was ever given the chance to defend himself. Very importantly, ostracism required a vote of 6000 citizens, so it was a collective decision, like the Greek abandonment of Philoktetes.

The question arising in this case is: were there recalls ever attested for victims of ostracism? There is a telling example of a recall of the ostracised just before the crucial year of 480 B.C.[29] Our information for this recall is mainly related to Aristeides,

---

[26] There is a debate about the introduction of ostracism. The *OCD* suggests that the law was introduced in 508-7 B.C. but the first ostracism took place in 487 B.C. See discussions in Thomsen (1972: 11-3); Fordsyke (2000: 233; 252); Harding (1994: 94-7); Lang (1990: 2-3); Vanderpool (1973: 217).

[27] See the discussion in Rhodes (1981: 267-71). For the difference between ostracism and *eisangelia*, see Marr and Worswick (1994-5: 285), who suggest that the former was a populist device; Fordsyke (2000: 254).

[28] Fordsyke (2000: 232). For Vanderpool (1973: 217), ostracism was an honourable exile.

[29] Burstein (1971: 94-99); Figueira (1987: 281). Suggestions that the relevant decree applied to all exiles, such as the one by Frost (1980: 126-8), are not supported by the language used in our sources. For this, see Marr (1998: 97). For recalls from exile, see Roisman (1981: 323-9).

recalled from ostracism by his former opponent, Themistokles[30] (Plu. *Them.* 11.1; cf. also *Arist.* 8.1):

> Ταῦτά τε δὴ μεγάλα τοῦ Θεμιστοκλέους, καὶ τοὺς πολίτας αἰσθόμενος ποθοῦντας Ἀριστείδην καὶ δεδιότας, μὴ δι' ὀργὴν τῷ βαρβάρῳ προσθεὶς ἑαυτὸν ἀνατρέψῃ τὰ πράγματα τῆς Ἑλλάδος (ἐξωστράκιστο γὰρ πρὸ τοῦ πολέμου καταστασιασθεὶς ὑπὸ Θεμιστοκλέους), γράφει ψήφισμα, τοῖς ἐπὶ χρόνῳ μεθεστῶσιν ἐξεῖναι κατελθοῦσι πράττειν καὶ λέγειν τὰ βέλτιστα τῇ Ἑλλάδι μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων πολιτῶν.

This recall is also mentioned by Aristoteles (*Ath.* 22.7). There is also the case of the much-disputed inscription, presenting the decree of Themistokles (*SEG* 18.153), which points to this recall.[31] This historically attested recall of the ostracised sometime before 480 B.C. offers additional ground for comparison with the story of Philoktetes. The hero is recalled to serve a vital need of the collective against an external enemy- the external enemy of the play could have been paralleled to the Persian invader of the fifth-century, occasionally attempting to collaborate with ostracised or exiled citizens (cf. p. 237, n. 54). In the same way that Athens was at the brink of a difficult battle before 480 B.C., so the Achaean expedition to Troy was at the time going through its most difficult phase. Additionally, Philoktetes is also sent for after a collective decision, sanctioned by the prophecy of Helenos. As with the victims of ostracism, he is restored back to his former status, as if nothing had intervened. Odysseus is

[30] Marr (1998: 96) argues that the assignment of the recall to Themistokles, although suggested only in Plu. *Them.* 11.1, should be considered probable.

[31] See Jameson (1960: 198-223); Burstein (1971: 98-9). See, furthermore, Johanson (2001: 91-2), for reservations concerning the authenticity of the epigraph.

responsible for the tragedy of the hero, and, at the same time, the one who puts the recall into action. Both in myth and real life, in such cases there must have been some hard feelings between the protagonists but the common cause would probably eliminate them eventually.

Here, of course, there is a danger of reading the work of Aischylos as propaganda for one politician or another. There was absolutely no need, though, for the poet to connect the story of Philoktetes to the personal story of Aristeides, as there was no need to connect the task of Odysseus to the decision of Themistokles to recall a former enemy.[32] The recall of the hero could simply be related to an institution of Athens with important political, social and national consequences, in a time when extreme conditions applied. This parallel could have helped the audience to understand the story, the characters and their motivation better. It would have also allowed the poet to touch on an existing problem that had got very intense in his time: the civic discords that deprived the city of significant individuals in a time of war. The *Philoktetes* of Aischylos remains the first attested case of transformation of the traditional story of the hero to a more complex one, where the two sides are further apart, decisions are harder to take and the collective needs to eliminate what appears to be an internal conflict before facing the external enemy.

---

[32] From a different point of view, it has been suggested by Avezzù (1988: 114-5), who points to the reference to Salamis as found in *TrGF* iii fr. **451q, that the *Philoktetes* of Aischylos implied the ostracism of Themistokles. Aischylos is often seen by some researchers to make allusions that present the politician under a positive light in his surviving plays (cf. p. 275). The fragment is, nevertheless, only circumstantially assigned to Aischylos' *Philoktetes*. What is more, references to Salamis should not always be taken to imply the victory of Themistokles or indicate propaganda.

The date

As far as the date of the *Philoktetes* is concerned, there have been several suggestions.[33] The play has been usually connected to a revival of interest in Lemnos circa the 470s B.C.,[34] or to political events, such as the ostracism of Themistokles in those years.[35] There is no secure evidence to this effect, however. Ostracism, in general, as a fifth-century practice that was in use for several decades, might have its bearing on how the poet interpreted the epic story, but it is difficult to suggest a date for the play based on this.

A *terminus ante quem* not far from the date of Aischylos' last performance has also been suggested. As noted by Pipili, the first appearance of the embassy to Philoktetes in art is circa 460 B.C. in Attic vase painting.[36] This is a fragment of a vase by the Euaion painter (*LIMC* Philoktetes 55a), on which we can see Philoktetes (there is an inscription ΦΙ... and the quiver of the hero), Odysseus and a third figure, still unidentified, perhaps Diomedes. If this is Diomedes, he could have been added by the painter under the influence of his presence in epic poetry, or alternatively he could have been mentioned, for example, along the lines of the false tale, as in Sophokles' *Philoktetes*. The plays of Euripides (431 B.C.) and Sophokles (409 B.C.) were presented much later and could not have influenced the vase of the 460s, as far as the presentation of an embassy is concerned. It is however possible that a lost source

[33] For proposed dates, see Jouan (1966: 315, n. 3); Calder (1970: 178); Kamerbeek (1980: 2); Mandel (1981: 95); Ferrari (1982: 154); Aélion i (1983: 61); Müller (2000: 39).

[34] See Luzatto (1980: 97, n. 3).

[35] Avezzù (1988: 102; 114-5).

[36] See Pipili in *LIMC* vii (1994: 384; 382).

existed that could have included Odysseus as the emissary before the play of Aischylos.[37]

There have also been several suggestions for the formation of a trilogy that would include the *Philoktetes*.[38] Pending evidence, however, one must not disregard the possibility that the play was not part of a connected trilogy.[39]

The influence of the Aischylean Philoktetes on drama

The intervention of Aischylos had a defining role on the future development of the myth of Philoktetes in drama. Euripides in 431 B.C. and Sophokles in 409 B.C. took up the same theme. Other tragedians, such as Philokles, Antiphon, Achaios and Theodektas, did the same (cf. pp. 239-40). Finally, in the Roman period, Accius wrote a homonymous tragedy. Aischylos' place in all these cannot fail to be discerned. The poet worked on the story of Philoktetes to create a confrontation of two men, each one responsible for the other's tragedy, and accentuated both the guilt of the culprit and resentment of the victim. His retelling of an epic myth created a new one in which the hero would never again simply be persuaded to rejoin the army and Odysseus would

[37] The example of the *Oresteia* Boston crater should be taken into account. See p. 25.

[38] Mette (1963: 99-103) suggested that the play was the second part of a trilogy consisting of a *Tennes* and the *Palamedes*. Ferrari (1982: 154) suggests that the *Philoktetes* is the third play in a tetralogy consisting of the *Iphigeneia* and the *Palamedes* and a satyr play that takes place in Tenedos. Jouan (1966: 315) and (1964: 7-9) and Aélion i (1983: 63, n. 15; 68) suggest that the play is part of a trilogy consisting of the *Herakleidai* (cf. *TrGF* iii fr. 73b), the *Tennes* and the *Philoktetes*. Note, however, that a *Tennes* is not included in the Catalogue and its existence is doubtful. See, further, Radt (1985: 343); Jouan (1964: 3-9). See, also, p. 9, n. 9.

[39] This is the view of Calder (1970: 179).

always be part of the embassy, but never with his true identity. Deception or force would be needed, if Philoktetes was to be brought to Troy. As Kiefer notes, in many aspects of the story the drama after Aischylos followed Aischylos and not the epic tradition.[40]

Euripides

Euripides presented his *Philoktetes* in 431 B.C. on the same occasion as he had presented the *Medeia.* Two discourses of Dion are helpful in this case: the fifty-second discourse, which was mentioned earlier, and the fifty-ninth discourse, a paraphrase of the prologue of Euripides' play. According to these, the play started with a soliloquy of Odysseus, who explained how he was sent by the kings to fetch Philoktetes (59.2), how he was responsible for what had happened to the abandoned hero (59.3), how Athena transformed him so as not to be recognised (59.3), and that a Trojan embassy was on its way to Lemnos because they also knew of the oracle that made Philoktetes indispensable for the fall of Troy and wanted him as their ally (59.4). Philoktetes was hostile (59.6) when he met the stranger, until the latter narrated a fictional story on how he was maltreated by Odysseus and mentioned Palamedes' story (59.8). Philoktetes then became friendlier and explained how he, too, was the victim of Odysseus' cunning (59.9). They both left to enter the cave (59.11) and, apparently, the *parodos* followed. Dion gives some additional information in the fifty second discourse. Odysseus was accompanied by Diomedes (52.14) – these two tend to be associated in epic. The

[40] Kiefer (1942: 39).

chorus consisted of Lemnians, who apologised for never visiting Philoktetes before (52.7). Aktor, a Lemnian, had been helping Philoktetes all these years (52.8).[41]

From the little that survives from the *Philoktetes* of Euripides we have *TrGF* v frs. 787-803 and the *hypothesis* (P. Oxy. 2455 fr. 17).[42] Kannicht, in his recent edition, edits *TrGF* v frs. 789b-d based on parts of the two discourses of Dion. In *TrGF* v fr. 789b (cf. Dion 52.12; 59.2-4) he recreates the prologue spoken by Odysseus. In *TrGF* v fr. 789c (cf. Dion 52.7) Kannicht presents the apology of the chorus to Philoktetes for never visiting him before. *TrGF* v fr. 789c (cf. Dion 59.5-11) is the recreation of a dialogue between Philoktetes and Odysseus where the latter tells the false story.

The rest of the fragments attest a soliloquy by Odysseus (*TrGF* v frs. 787-9), a saying that happy is he who stays at his house (*TrGF* v fr. 789a; cf. *TrGF* iii fr. 317), some remarks on the current situation on the island and the cave of the hero (*TrGF* v frs. 790-**790a), the pains of Philoktetes (*TrGF* v frs. 791-2a; cf. *TrGF* iii frs. 253-5), an effort to persuade the hero to benefit from the given situation (*TrGF* v fr. 794),[43] a disbelief in human ability to explain oracles (*TrGF* v fr. 795) - parts of what seems to be the agon between the Greek and the Trojan embassy (*TrGF* v frs. 796[44]-8) - and a passage on how our anger must be mortal as our body is (*TrGF* v fr. 799), perhaps as admonition to Philoktetes. Moreover, there is a statement that a man who is bad loses his friends

[41] For a detailed reconstruction of the play, see Müller (2000: 221ff.).

[42] Turner (1962a: 45; 65-6).

[43] Kannicht (2004: 839) assigns this to a Trojan.

[44] Kannicht (2004: 840) assings this to Odysseus.

(*TrGF* v fr. 799a) and a wish to be loved by the gods (*TrGF* v fr. 800). The last three fragments are of lexicographical interest (*TrGF* v frs. 801-3).

In the case of the *Philoktetes*, Euripides prefers the outline of the Aischylean story on Philoktetes over the epic and other pre-existing versions. The poet preserves the Aischylean embassy by Odysseus to Philoktetes, the guilt of the former and the concealment of his identity, Philoktetes' resentment for Odysseus, the Lemnian chorus, Philoktetes' pains and his plea for death, as well as the false story of Odysseus to befriend the lonely hero.

Secondly, Euripides alludes to the work of his predecessor by correcting a few of the discrepancies of the Aischylean play, as these were later pointed out by Dion. The first has to do with the concealment of Odysseus' identity that could, as Dion notes, (52.6) give food for accusations against Aischylos for implausibility:

> ὥστε τυχὸν ἄν τις ἐγκαλέσαι τῶν οὐ φιλούντων τὸν ἄνδρα (sc. Aischylos), ὅτι οὐδὲν αὐτῷ ἐμέλησεν ὅπως πιθανὸς ἔσται ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς οὐ γιγνωσκόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Φιλοκτήτου.

In Euripides, on the other hand, Athena sends a dream to Odysseus instructing him how to approach Philoktetes and promising to change his appearance and voice (cf. Dion 59.3).[45]

[45] Euripides is in a sense more Homeric in certain respects, for example in his use of transformation of the hero; in the *Odyssey* Athena transforms Odysseus several times with her magic wand (cf. 13.429; 16.173; 456). In Euripides, however, the transformation takes place off-stage.

Moreover, Euripides solves the problems that Dion (52.7) notes in relation to the Lemnians and their rapports with the hero. In Aischylos, Philoktetes narrates his misfortunes to the chorus, as if it is the first time he had ever met them and this might cause unjust objections, according to Dion (52.9):

> οὐ τοίνυν οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνο δοκεῖ μοι δικαίως ἄν τις αἰτιάσασθαι, τὸ διηγεῖσθαι πρὸς τὸν χορὸν ὡς ἀγνοοῦντα τὰ περὶ τὴν ἀπόλειψιν τὴν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν καὶ τὰ καθόλου συμβαίνοντα αὐτῷ.

Euripides, who apparently spotted this, inserted the apology of the Lemnian chorus to the hero for never having visited him before, and, additionally, invented Aktor, a figure with a function similar to that of Autourgos in the *Elektra*, who takes care of the hero for the years before the members of the Lemnian chorus meet him. The approach of Euripides, as Dion notes, is πολιτικώτερον καὶ ἀκριβέστερον, whereas the Aischylean approach is τραγικώτερον καὶ ἁπλούστερον (52.7).

Finally, Dion, in his comparison of the two plays, offers some more general conclusions concerning the way in which Euripides insists on details, unlike Aischylos (52.11):

> ἥ τε τοῦ Εὐριπίδου σύνεσις καὶ περὶ πάντα ἐπιμέλεια, ὥστε μήτε ἀπίθανόν τι καὶ παρημελημένον ἐᾶσαι μήτε ἁπλῶς τοῖς πράγμασι χρῆσθαι, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πάσης ἐν τῷ εἰπεῖν δυνάμεως, ὥσπερ ἀντίστροφός ἐστι τῇ τοῦ Αἰσχύλου, πολιτικωτάτη καὶ ῥητορικωτάτη οὖσα καὶ τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσι πλείστην ὠφελείαν παρασχεῖν δυναμένη.

Dion could be exaggerating the differences between the art of the two poets in order to serve his argument better, but the differences in details which he mentions (noted above) between the two plays cannot be disregarded. The explanatory additions of Euripides are apparently meant to make the story more realistic, even if they are not necessarily of decisive importance in the plot of the play. However, they could become pointers of intertextuality.[46] It is, no doubt, difficult to prove intertextual allusions between two texts when you are operating with only a few lines of both. Nevertheless, the practice of Euripides in his surviving plays, along with the *testimonium* of Dion, could indicate the extent to which Euripides could occasionally allude in his text to Aischylos. The most interesting example of intertextuality among the surviving plays is, of course, found in Euripides' *Elektra*, where the recognition scene alludes to the one in Aischylos' *Choephoroi*. There Euripides dedicates time and space to oppose the recognition means that Aischylos had employed before him.[47] He does this in very clear terms and even uses the same words. There are more cases of intertextuality suggested, but none is as clear and as elaborate as the recognition scene.[48] A brief but

[46] The current study employs the term 'intertextuality' in full awareness that this is all but a clear one. Kovacs (1995: 570, n. 6) expresses reservations for the term. Allen (2000: 2) also notes the problematic nature of the term, however central in contemporary literary theory.

[47] There has been for years a long discussion on this Euripidean passage. Fraenkel iii (1950: 826) was in favour of the view that E. *El.* 518-44 was interpolated by a later producer of the play. Thereafter the lines are generally considered Euripidean. See Lloyd-Jones (1961: 181); Fitton Brown (1961: 370); Bain (1977: 111); Basta Donzelli (1980: 116); Davies (1998: 400); West (1980: 17) believes that the lines are a later addition by Euripides himself; Kovacs (1989: 67; 78) sees here a later addition by Euripides under the influence of middle comedy.

[48] See, for example, Davies (1998: 397-8) who discusses two more passages in E. *Elektra* (ll. 1225-42; 671-93) in relation to the *Choephoroi*. Davies, moreover, discuses (*ibid.*: 395) references in E. *Ba.* in relation to A. *Eu.* 25-6, where it is suggested that Dionysos himself led his army in a battle against Pentheus.

evident example, however, is the rejection of the vast scene of Aischylos' *Seven* presenting all seven warriors and their shields, in one single line in Euripides' *Phoinissai* 751.[49] The way in which the descriptions of the warriors and their shields are used in the *teichoskopia* of the same play should also be noted.[50] The trial of Orestes in Euripides' homonymous play as opposed to the *Eumenides*' trial is a further example.[51]

In view of the above, the comparative reading of the two plays by Dion merits closer attention. Dion clearly speaks of repeated examples of corrective details, responding to the play of Aischylos, all in a single play of Euripides. Davies suggests that Euripides sometimes criticises Aischylos in order to draw attention to his own novel treatment.[52] This is correct, but it should not be limited to the passages where intertextual allusions are to be found. Euripides employs these intertextual allusions to draw attention to his treatment of the myth as a whole; the allusions are inserted to call for a broader comparison.

In the *Philoktetes*, Euripides' personal contribution to the story is apparently the inclusion of a Trojan embassy in the myth of the hero's recall. Obviously, this would give the play a new direction and would allow the poet to work more freely on a subject

[49] This is discussed in Mastronarde (1994: 360-1), who sees here the playful acknowledgment on the part of Euripides of preceding tradition, that does not necessarily imply any form of rejection; Davies (1998: 396).

[50] See the discussion in Mastronarde (1994: 167-73).

[51] See discussions in Hall (1993: 266); Willink (1986: 223-5); Zeitlin (1980: 64-8); West (1987: 31-2); Rawson (1972: 155-7); Winnington-Ingram (1969: 133-5).

[52] Davies (1998: 402).

already elaborated on by Aischylos. Aischylos had already created and placed the personal conflict of the two heroes in the frame of a national fight and Euripides takes this even further by putting on stage the external enemies, who attempt to benefit from the internal crisis that the Greeks are facing.

The *agon* between Greeks and Trojans would probably have been important in the play, and it would naturally minimise the importance of the collision between Odysseus and Philoktetes, shifting the weight to the Greek-Trojan fight over Philoktetes. This would complicate the play considerably, since there would now be a competition for Philoktetes' support, and the hero would not be dependent on the Greeks to rescue him; instead, at the end, he makes a patriotic choice. If we trust Dion, there was a further twist in the play of Euripides; a degradation of the characters and their *ethos* in comparison to that of Aischylos (cf. pp. 216-7). Aischylos' old-time heroes were turned into contemporary politicians, and Dion insists that the Euripidean play on Philoktetes was *politikotaton* (52.7; 11; 14).

This Euripidean innovation could have originated from real-life experiences. The play was presented not much later than 435-4 B.C, when the Corcyrean and Corinthian embassies arrived at Athens at the same time to request the alliance of the city, when Corcyra was under the attack of Corinth (Th. 1.31-44).[53] Additionally, there were also cases of exiled or ostracised Athenians whom the Persians approached to request their

[53] See Hornblower i (1991: 66-7), for details of the incident and (*ibid.*: 75-6), for the rhetoric of the speeches as found in Thoukydides. See, moreover, Wilson (1987: 129-30).

alliance against Athens and the poet might have had such incidents in mind.[54] Several plays of Euripides have been suggested to point to his influence by contemporary events.[55]

To conclude, the *testimonia* and the fragments of the Euripidean *Philoktetes* allow one to suggest that the play was, in a way, a model example of the reception of Aischylos' work, in three steps. Firstly, Euripides repeats the Aischylean outline of the plot, secondly, he adds the corrective additions that signal his divergence from Aischylos in form and, thirdly, he inserts a new episode or element that re-defines the story and marks its divergence from the older poet, this time in substance.

Sophokles

Sophokles presented his *Philoktetes*, a play that we are more acquainted with, in 409 B.C. and won first prize.[56] Dion praises the play and notes that it was not as simple as the Aischylean and not as elaborate as the Euripidean, and that Sophokles' version of things was excellent (52.15). Dion, furthermore, praises the *ethos* of the characters of Sophokles, especially Neoptolemos' (52.16), in the same way as he praises the Aischylean characters for their *ethos*, their epic quality and distance from his own age's immorality (52.4-5). As in the former tragedies, Odysseus' guilt (ll. 47; 264) prevents him from appearing in person and Sophokles overcomes this problem by inserting

[54] Burstein (1971: 108); Figueira (1987: 299-300). See, moreover, Roisman (1981: 326-9), for cases of collaboration of exiles with foreign powers in order to achieve the return to their city *vi et armis*.

[55] See, for example, the discussion in Hall (1993: 265-8); Holzhausen (2003: 23-208), for the *Orestes*; Collard ii (1975: 206-12), for the *Hiketides*; Craik (1988: 44-5), for the *Phoinissai*.

[56] Radt (1983: 224) suggests that the *Philoktetes ho en Troiai* was produced on the same occasion.

Neoptolemos in the story. The latter tells a false story, once more, to befriend the hero. The onset of pain is repeated, as well as the wish for death (respectively ll. 797-8, 748-9 and 1202-12). Philoktetes speaks of his homeland and father and narrates his personal story (ll. 490-99).

Davies suspects a case of intertextual allusion between the prologue of Sophokles' *Philoktetes* (ll. 11-4) and Aischylos' *Philoktetes*, and considers this to be the criticism of Sophokles on the length of the prologue of the latter.[57] There is no indication that this should be related to the play of Aischylos, however. It is rather more probable that this should be related to the play of Euripides (431 B.C.), which, according to Dion (59.2), started with a prologue by Odysseus.

Sophokles wrote on the same story that the two tragedians before him did. Aischylos had a more straightforward approach, but lacked an explanation of why Odysseus was not recognised. Euripides, on the other hand, presented Odysseus as transformed by Athena, thus explaining what Aischylos did not and, at the same time, inserting in the story the aspect of divine will at the side of Odysseus and his cause. Sophokles did not engage in transformations or danger of recognition. Interestingly, Sophokles is more naturalistic in his presentation of Odysseus. Even so, this again is a kind of intertextual dialogue with preceding tradition. Sophokles opted for a different version and kept Odysseus at the background of the action, replacing him with a youth that he almost completely controlled. This control was, of course, to be overthrown later in the play.

[57] Davies (1998: 399-400).

Sophokles' insertion of Neoptolemos was a clever innovation that gave the poet a way out of the recognition problem and opened up new directions for the plot.[58] Philoktetes and Odysseus' enmity only works in the background, and the young hero with his dilemma steals the performance.

Additionally, unlike the two earlier tragedies, the chorus consists of sailors and the island is uninhabited, to make the desertion more absolute, perhaps the boldest change in the whole play. Once more, as with the transformation, Sophokles avoids touching on the problematic issue of a Lemnian chorus never having visited Philoktetes before. This would mean that, consciously or subconsciously, Sophokles touched on both problems that Dion notes for the play of Aischylos (the concealment of Odysseus' identity and the rapports of Philoktetes with the chorus). His approach is, on both occasions, very different than that of Aischylos or Euripides, probably in search of originality. Additionally, the resolution of the play involves Herakles, who appears to persuade the hero to go to Troy (ll. 1409ff.). There is no evidence that there was divine intervention in the previous plays.

In the rest of the literature we come across some more cases of a *Philoktetes*. Antiphon (*TrGF* i 55 fr. 3), a generation younger than Euripides, and Philokles (*TrGF* i 24 fr. 1), the nephew of Aischylos, are both attested as having written a homonymous tragedy. Nothing but the title survives in both cases. Theodektas (*TrGF* i 72 frs. 5b 1-2), one of Aischylos' successors, chose to have Philoktetes bitten by the snake on the hand and

[58] Kiefer (1942: 45) suggests that the role of Neoptolemos was Sophokles' great stroke of originality.

this could have been used ingeniously, if Philoktetes was not able to use his bow. It would also serve reasons of variety, when the great triad of the fifth century had handled this theme. Achaios (*TrGF* i 20 fr. 37) probably wrote a *Philoktetes ho en Troiai.*

Rome

Accius wrote a *Philocteta* and is believed to have practised *contaminatio* with the work of all three great tragedians. Twenty-two fragments survive, and it can be inferred that the argument combines elements from all the tragedies mentioned by Dion. Odysseus was the one sent to persuade Philoktetes to rejoin the army (fr. 1 D'Antó) and the hero was half-persuaded and half-forced to return. The audience witnessed an onset of the hero's pains (frs. 10; 11; 19; 20 D'Antó), and Lemnos was not a deserted island (fr. 3 D'Antó). It has been suggested that there are two allusions to Aischylean tragedy, a reference to the Kabeiroi (cf. *TrGF* iii 95-97a) and a reference to Prometheus (fr. 2 D'Antó).[59] There is also a verbal parallel between Accius and Aischylos (fr. 22 D'Antó).[60]

Nevertheless, Euripides' presence is also evident in the fragments of Accius. Odysseus is present in the prologue (fr. 1 D'Antó), and a pastor, perhaps the Euripidean Aktor, is one of the characters (fr. 3 D'Antó). In fr. 17 we read that the Trojans are more humane than the Greeks and in fr. 18 (D'Antó) somebody appears to be blaming Paris

[59] Bucalo (1977: 35).

[60] Bucalo (1977: 48) notes the word *dracontem* (fr. 22) alongside the Aischylean δράκων of *TrGF* iii fr. 252.

for something, although this does not presuppose his presence. This could be reminiscent of the dispute between Trojan and Greek elements in the Euripidean play, or it could even signal the possible repetition of the motif. However, in default of further evidence, one cannot assign a Trojan embassy to Accius. Finally, Accius, like Sophokles, used the chorus of Odysseus' companions to replace the Lemnians that both Aischylos and Euripides had used (fr. 1 D'Antó).[61]

It is not easy to decide which Greek play was the main model of Accius, if there was one, but it certainly seems to have been closer to Aischylos and Euripides, since Neoptolemos is not present. The fragments do not allow us to deduce whether Accius used the fundamental innovation of the Trojan embassy or simply the corrective innovations that Euripides brought to Aischylos' story. This is, however, an important question because, if the embassy was not part of the Roman tragedy, then the play would probably revolve around the confrontation of the two men and would, thus, be closer to Aischylos. Nonetheless, the evidence attests that Accius blended elements from the work of all three great tragedians on Philoktetes.[62] This makes the play of Accius on Philoktetes an important example, perhaps the clearest of the ones discussed in this study, of the Latin *emulatio*.

[61] Noted by D'Antó (1980: 424).

[62] For the tendency of Roman poets to combine elements from various Greek poets in their dramas, see pp. 315-9.

Palamedes

The story of Palamedes

Two different storylines are attested for Palamedes, and the main difference between the two is that in the former the hero suffers a violent and unjustified death at the hands of individuals, whereas in the latter his death comes as the result of a trial at the hands of the collective. There are variables, such as the motives of Odysseus, the mythical figure who is always responsible, in one way or another, for the death of the hero. Occasionally the murder is an act of revenge on the part of Odysseus because Palamedes revealed his feigned madness and forced him to join the campaign against Troy. Other times the motive is Odysseus' jealousy for the status which Palamedes enjoyed among the Achaeans, who admired him for the inventions that are often attributed to him.

For the first version of the murder there is the testimony of the *Kypria*, where the hero suffers a violent death at the hands of Odysseus and Diomedes while fishing (*PEG* fr. 30, as in Paus. 10.31.2):

> Παλαμήδην δὲ ἀποπνιγῆναι προελθόντα ἐπὶ ἰχθύων θήραν, Διομήδην δὲ τὸν ἀποκτείναντα εἶναι καὶ Ὀδυσσέα ἐπιλεξάμενος ἐν ἔπεσιν οἶδα τοῖς Κυπρίοις.[1]

[1] Zografou-Lyra (1987: 153-4) thinks that Pausanias chose this version over others, due to the word ἐπιλεξάμενος that is found in his text, and she notes primitiveness in the way Palamedes was killed and the pair of the murderers as indicative that this was an older version. This is not improbable, but the word could simply mean that Pausanias read the story.

The reason for this is, apparently, Odysseus' bitterness at the exposure of his feigned madness against the man who forced him to join the expedition to Troy, an incident narrated in Proklos' summary of the *Kypria* (*PEG argumentum* 30-3).[2] The summary, however, mentions only briefly the hero's death in Asia Minor (*PEG argumentum* 66: ἔπειτά ἐστι Παλαμήδους θάνατος), and if it had not been for Pausanias, there would have been no known details. A similar version to that of the *Kypria* is found in Diktys (2.15), apparently a reminiscence of the epic tradition, where the hero once more suffers a violent death at the hands of Odysseus and Diomedes. In the work of Diktys the two persuade the hero to go down a well to find gold, which they will subsequently supposedly share, and when he descends down the well they stone him to death. Although the story resembles that of the *Kypria*, there are certain elements that point to the influence of the trial version of the hero's death, such as the amount of gold and the stoning of the hero, which will be discussed later on. The gold element, as well as the addition of the well in the story, could also reflect folktale, as pointed out by Zografou-Lyra.[3] These two versions are the only ones where the murderers are Odysseus and Diomedes, the crime is unpredictable and unjustified and the motive is revenge on the part of Odysseus. The murder seems to end a personal hostility of Odysseus against Palamedes. The army has no involvement whatsoever and apparently Odysseus does not have to justify his action to anyone.

[2] Another fragment of the *Kypria* (*PEG* fr. 29.16-8) mentions that Agamemnon sent Palamedes to fetch the Oinotropoi to stop the famine.

[3] Zografou-Lyra (1987: 155).

The silence of Homer

Although Palamedes was prominent in tradition, Homer does not mention him. Many explanations for this puzzling silence were attempted even in antiquity. Strabon (8.6.2) suggested that Palamedes' story was invented by later epic poets. Other explanations are anecdotal, for example, Odysseus' ghost supposedly asked Homer not to mention Palamedes in his story if he was to narrate to him what happened during the Trojan War (Philostratos *Her.* 43.15; cf. 33-34).

It is not clear whether Homer knew the story of Palamedes' death, but he knew of the reluctance of Odysseus to join the war (cf. *Od.* 24.118-9). Stanford suggests that if Homer implies this incident, then he possibly knows the story with Palamedes, but omits it for the sake of Odysseus' prestige as a hero.[4] Of course, the incident of the death of Palamedes is not chronologically within the scope of either Homeric poem and, secondly, there need not be a single explanation for the silence of both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The *Odyssey*, for example, clearly would not welcome references to a past story which presented Odysseus, its main hero, as immoral. On the other hand, the *Iliad* might simply not have any cause to mention the story of Odysseus' reluctance, which is irrelevant while the hero conducts his fighting.

The intervention of lyric poetry

One of the most important changes in the story is the establishment of Palamedes as an inventor. The earliest surviving reference to one of his inventions is found in

[4] Stanford (1954: 83); Szarmach (1974a: 37-8).

Stesichoros' *Oresteia*, where the hero is referred to as the inventor of the alphabet (*PMG* fr. 213): Στησίχορος δὲ ἐν δευτέρῳ Ὀρεστείας [. . .] τὸν Παλαμήδην φησὶν εὑρηκέναι (sc. the letters). Although the fragment of Stesichoros has preserved for us evidence for the invention of writing only, his inventions seem to have been many and various. If it is in Stesichoros' text that one first comes across the notion of Palamedes as inventor and the establishment of his place and reputation among the army, then perhaps it is here that the new cause of conflict between him and Odysseus can be traced: jealousy.[5] Though we cannot exclude the possibility that the events concerning Palamedes featured only as a passing digression in Stesichoros' *Oresteia*, what we can glean from the tradition elsewhere suggests that there was some connection between these and the main story of Agamemnon's return home in the form of Nauplios' revenge.

There are two different traditions on how Nauplios avenged the Achaeans for the murder of his son. The first consisted of a trip around all the Greek cities in an effort to persuade the wives of the Achaean leaders to be unfaithful to their husbands (schol. Lykophron 386; 1093). The other is the setting up of false beacons to cause the destruction of the Achaean ships that were returning back home (schol. E. *Or.* 432; schol. Lykophron 386). Stesichoros also wrote a *Nostoi*, and this could also accommodate the revenge of Nauplios. Stesichoros did not have to be consistent on the mode of the revenge of Nauplios in both of his poems; he could have offered two different versions in two unrelated poems. For example, in a story where Klytaimnestra

[5] Szarmach (1974a: 45).

is unfaithful to her husband, like the *Oresteia*, the *moicheia* version of revenge seems to be more plausible. The false beacon story could perhaps be better related to the *Nostoi*, as the reason why other heroes did not reach home. If the invention of writing in the lyric poem implies the death of the hero and opens the way for the revenge of Nauplios to be mentioned, it would be plausible to suggest that Agamemnon does carry some responsibility for the death of Palamedes, at least in the eyes of his father. Lack of evidence concerning the version of Stesichoros should prevent us from drawing conclusions on the form of Odysseus' revenge.

Aélion and Zografou-Lyra suggest that it was lyric poetry that initiated the motif of the trial, in the light of fr. 260.7 of Pindar (εἰς σοφίας λόγον), which shows that the two heroes had a contest of wisdom. Would this be an *agon* that would result in the death of Palamedes? It is not improbable, although what survives from Pindar seems to imply that the story only received brief treatment from the lyric poet. In any case, we cannot know with certainty if it was Pindar or Aischylos who first spoke of an *agon* between Odysseus and Palamedes, since they were close contemporaries.

The trial version

Even though lyric could have implied or even narrated an *agon* of words, it was tragedy that had the means to stage a trial (cf. Polyainos proem. Book 1 *Strategemata*) and it was fifth-century Athens that had a special interest in legal procedures and the form of

the trial.[6] This leads us to the second version of the story as surviving in tragedians and other writers, which has the following recurring elements: Odysseus is always preserved as the mastermind behind the murder, but he is no longer the actual murderer. He achieves his purpose by falsely accusing the hero of being a traitor and fabricating evidence against him. The hero is brought to trial and defends his innocence with a speech that enumerates all his inventions and how these had helped the army. The trial ends with the hero's condemnation, and he is stoned to death by the collective.

We first turn to the surviving texts in order to understand the main lines of the story before proceeding with the fragments of tragedy. In Apollodoros (*Epit.* 3.7-8) Odysseus forces a Trojan prisoner to write the letter that is supposedly to prove the treason of Palamedes, plants it in the camp and a search is then conducted by Agamemnon. Palamedes is brought to trial, during which he is confident of his innocence, but is finally stoned to death by the army. In Hyginus 105 and in Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid* 2.81 the same version is elaborated further; Odysseus supposedly has a dream that he uses to persuade the Achaeans to move the camp for a day, and during that time he plants the letter on the Trojan prisoner whom he then kills close to the camp. When the army is away he hides the gold that Priamos supposedly sent to Palamedes in the latter's tent, and the outcome is the same. The scholia on Euripides' *Orestes* 432 mention that Odysseus and Diomedes, who interestingly re-enters the story here, created the false evidence on which the hero was judged and

[6] See Kennedy (1963: 27); Gagarin (1994: 46-7; 59); Harris (1994: 130-40), for the increased consciousness of rhetorical techniques in fifth-century Athens that was related to judicial procedure.

killed out of jealousy. There are many more *testimonia* for this version and there is no need to mention them all, but one should mention Philostratos' *Heroikos* 33.24, because, as Aélion notes, he presents aspects of the story that we would not otherwise know.[7] Philostratos speaks of a friendship between Palamedes and Achilleus on which Odysseus bases his attempt to engender suspicions in Agamemnon that the heroes were planning to usurp his authority. Agamemnon and Odysseus have the hero stoned, after the latter fabricates the evidence (gold and letter), while Achilleus and Aias defend Palamedes. Palamedes speaks of justice and of the truth dying with him. He believes that his death will be avenged.

Evidently, the story has gone through a transition, and has turned from a simple epic story with the revenge and the violent death themes, to a more complex story. This transition may have been gradual, and not all details needed to be introduced at the same time.

The Palamedes of Aischylos

The tragedy is not attested in the Catalogue of plays, but is attested in the scholia on Homer (schol. *Il.* 4.319), where one of the three surviving fragments is found (*TrGF* iii fr. 181). *TrGF* iii fr. 181, assigned to the Aischylean *Palamedes* by the scholiast, presents a father demanding from someone the reason for the murder of his son:

τίνος κατέκτας ἕνεκα παῖδ' ἐμὸν βλάβης;

[7] Aélion i (1983: 49).

It is most probably Nauplios, the father of Palamedes addressing Odysseus or Agamemnon.[8] The next two fragments (*TrGF* iii fr. **181a and *182) seem to be part of a speech that Palamedes made to defend himself and in which he listed everything that he had invented, notably the numbers (*TrGF* iii fr. **181a):

<ΠΑΛ.>
ἔπειτα πάσης Ἑλλάδος καὶ ξυμμάχων
βίον διῴκησ' ὄντα πρὶν πεφυρμένον
θηρσίν θ' ὅμοιον· πρῶτα μὲν τὸν πάνσοφον
ἀριθμὸν ηὗρηκ' ἔξοχον σοφισμάτων

Then follows the way in which he organised the army (*TrGF* iii fr. *182):

<ΠΑΛ.>
καὶ ταξιάρχας †καὶ στρατάρχας καὶ ἑκατοντάρχας†
ἔταξα, σῖτον δ' εἰδέναι διώρισα,
ἄριστα, δεῖπνα δόρπα θ' αἱρεῖσθαι τρίτα

TrGF iii fr. *182a is a *testimonium* found in the scholia on *Prometheus* 457, suggesting that the invention of the numbers was assigned by Aischylos both to Prometheus in the *Prometheus* and Palamedes in the homonymous play: τούτων τὴν εὕρεσιν καὶ Παλαμήδῃ προσῆψεν (sc. Aischylos)· ἴσως δὲ κἀκεῖνος ἐκ Προμηθέως.

[8] See the suggestions as noted in Radt (1985: 295); Falcetto (2002: 18).

Most probably the *Palamedes* presented the hero as an inventor who at some point gave a speech enumerating his inventions and, therefore, his contribution to the army in order to defend himself. Palamedes' contribution to humanity appears to take dimensions as time goes by, and as Platon notes, tragedy presented the hero as a great inventor (*R.* 7.522 D):

> παγγέλιον γοῦν, ἔφην, στρατηγὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις Παλαμήδης ἑκάστοτε ἀποφαίνει· ἢ οὐκ ἐννενόηκας ὅτι φησὶν ἀριθμὸν εὑρών, τάς τε τάξεις τῷ στρατοπέδῳ καταστῆσαι ἐν Ἰλίῳ καὶ ἐξαριθμῆσαι ναῦς τε καὶ τἆλλα πάντα, ὡς πρὸ τοῦ ἀναριθμήτων ὄντων καὶ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος, ὡς ἔοικεν, οὐδ' ὅσους πόδας εἶχεν εἰδότος, εἴπερ ἀριθμεῖν μὴ ἠπίστατο;

Palamedes in tragedy becomes the benefactor of mankind, the civiliser, a human Prometheus. He acquires the power to change people's lives and becomes in a way comparable only to a god. This is why he becomes a greater problem for Odysseus than he initially was.

It is evident from the fragments that the poet included in the *Palamedes* both the story of the hero's death and the arrival of his father at the Achaean camp after the murder (*TrGF* iii fr. 181). How do these few pieces of evidence form an argument for the play and where is the story- as presented by Aischylos - placed in the long tradition of Palamedes' myth? To start with a crude point as far as the argument is concerned: this play cannot deal with the simple ambush and murder version. The play most probably does represent the more complex version that includes a trial scene where a speech in

the first person was made by Palamedes who defended himself (cf. *TrGF* iii frs. **181a, *182). Apparently the hero is accused of treason by Odysseus, the usual suspect, who had manufactured the evidence against him and is brought to trial in front of the army. A false letter from Priamos, proving the connection of the two men and an amount of gold hidden by Odysseus in Palamedes' tent, as found in later literature, probably has its roots in this tragedy, though not all of these details need to have occurred. The Achaeans are, finally, persuaded of his guilt.

An on-stage trial

In tragedy, as Polyainos (proem. Book 1 *Strategemata*) notes, the condemnation of the hero happens in court:

> οἷον δὲ κἀκεῖνο στρατήγημα Ὀδυσσέως οἱ τραγῳδοὶ ᾄδουσι. Παλαμήδην ἐνίκησεν Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐν δικαστηρίῳ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ὑποβαλὼν αὐτοῦ τῇ σκηνῇ βαρβαρικὸν χρυσίον, καὶ ὁ σοφώτατος τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐκεῖνος ἥλω προδοσίας δόλῳ καὶ στρατηγήματι.

The trial, at least in its developed form, is likely to be a fifth-century innovation in the story.[9] Even if lyric poetry presented an *agon* of words in which Palamedes was accused and then defended himself, it is doubtful whether there would be a full and formal trial. It is in tragedy where Palamedes faces accusations of treason, is then brought to trial, gives a speech and is finally condemned. The question is: how similar would the on-stage trial be to the trials taking place in the Athenian courts at the time? Would it recreate both their form and their content, following the fixed norms of such a

[9] See Woodford (1994: 165).

procedure? Would the audience actually see a court setting? How close to reality would this trial of Palamedes be to the impeachment of generals in Athens?

As noted by Carey, a typical Athenian trial would have a linear and continuous speech from both parties, in which each would present their evidence.[10] Carey and Buxton both note the importance of continuous speech as means of persuasion in Classical Greece.[11] In the courts, the accuser would speak first and then the defendant, who would normally represent himself. After both sides spoke, the judges would then cast their votes. A prominent feature of the litigant's speech would be the *captatio benevolentiae*, which would be an effort to draw the judges' sympathy by reminding them of his morality.[12] The litigant would further exhibit his *ethos* with the enumeration of his previous services to the city as a means of persuasion of his innocence.[13] This diversion from answering with reference to the accusation at hand by focusing on the reputation of the litigant would occasionally be extensive and as a result, more in the sphere of rhetoric than of substance.[14]

There are several examples from fifth-century Athenian trials where defence speeches are based on the character of the man accused. Miltiades' friends, for example, in his second trial used his contribution to the battle of Marathon and Lemnos to persuade the

[10] Carey (1997: 13-4).

[11] Carey (1997: 14); Buxton (1982: 10-8).

[12] Carey (1994: 26-34).

[13] Carey (1994: 34-9).

[14] Rhodes (2004: 137-8).

judges to reject the death penalty (Hdt 6.134-6).[15] Lysias in *Hyper Mantitheou*, in a *dokimasia* trial where the litigant was opposed when selected for office as a member of the Boule on the grounds that he had served the cavalry under the Thirty, notes that in such cases it is appropriate to give an account of one's whole life (16.9) to explain a rather extensive reference to his background (16.10-7).[16]

Aischylos' own life is informative: the former military services of the poet to the city played an important role in his acquittal when accused of revealing the Eleusinian mysteries through his plays. *TrGF* iii *testimonium* L93b.9-11 reads:

> τῶν δικαστῶν αὐτὸν (sc. Aischylos) ἀφέντων μάλιστα διὰ τὰ πραχθέντα αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ἐπὶ Μαραθῶνι μάχῃ· ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ Κυνέγειρος ἀπεκόπη τὰς χεῖρας, αὐτὸς δὲ πολλὰ τρωθεὶς φοράδην ἀνηνέχθη.

There is a more dramatic version of his acquittal in circulation (*TrGF* iii *testimonium* L94), according to which Aischylos' younger brother Ameinias, who had lost his hand in the naval battle of Salamis, was present in court and showed his wound to remind the judges of his family's contribution to the war. Aischylos was acquitted when the judges saw the wound of Ameinias, apparently because it reminded them of the gratitude that the family of Euphorion deserved for an illustrious participation in the Persian war, as this is attested by several *testimonia* related to all three sons of the

[15] The example is further discussed in Bauman (1990: 18).

[16] Further discussed in Carey (1994: 40-1); Rhodes (2004: 139).

family (*TrGF* iii *testimonia* F11-51). Even if fictitious,[17] the reference to Ameinias' help in the acquittal of his brother is indicative of the practices in Athenian courts of the time and of the importance of the litigant's past benefactions to the city, which in the case of Aischylos had been at a great cost.

As in trials in real life, so in the treason trial in the *Palamedes* the hero reminds the Achaean judges of his inventions and therefore his former good services to them. The point he makes is the following: how could he be considered an enemy after all he had done for the organisation of the army (*TrGF* iii frs. **181a-*182)? This could also be an appeal for *charis*.[18] One would expect Odysseus to have made the prosecution speech before that of Palamedes. During his clearly persuasive speech Odysseus would present whatever evidence he had against the hero, and since the accusation was fictitious, the evidence could very well have been fabricated, as in other cases of the same myth in later literature. Apparently, the case could be again an irrefutable combination of letter and gold, or one of the two. The judges would then vote for the condemnation of Palamedes to death.

The trial of Palamedes would, therefore, be a rare case in tragedy where we have both a court setting and balanced speeches in the forensic manner – usually we have one or the other. The story itself calls for a presentation of a proper trial. Euripides, who makes

[17] The biographies of ancient poets often include fictitious elements. See Lefkowitz (1981: 8-9 intro.); Chitwood (2004: 5-11). Fairweather (1974: 256), moreover, suggests that long-standing popular tradition might have influenced certain *Vitae*.

[18] Appeals for *charis* by the defendants are found in speeches, as are appeals by the accusers for not granting *charis* (e.g. Lysias 14.40; Lykourgos 135).

the most extensive use of the balanced *agon*, never in fact stages a trial in what survives.[19] Apparently he may have included one in his *Palamedes*, which is now lost (cf. p. 263). The *Eumenides*, on the other hand, presents a trial, in that the case for prosecution and defence is put to the court, the jurors vote, and a verdict is declared. But it has no set speeches, as Lloyd has pointed out.[20] Taking all into account, the *Palamedes* of Aischylos may have been the first presentation of a trial scene on stage.

The trial in the later *Oresteia* would resemble in many aspects the one in the *Palamedes*. A basic difference however is that in the case of the *Palamedes* the accuser, the litigant and the judges were all human. This may have stimulated resemblance to an Athenian real-life trial more than the *Eumenides'* trial would; the participation of gods in the trial for Orestes would have made it more distant from reality. On the other hand, perhaps where the gods are involved the outcome is more reassuring.

It is not necessary, however, to take the further step of supposing that this was the moment when the *agon* entered tragedy. *Agones* could exist outside trials, as we know from Aischylos' successors. In fact, there are other plays of Aischylos that seem to include some form of *agon* without including a trial. Although the dates for these are not known, they should be taken into account. For instance, there is the confrontation

[19] Lloyd (1992: 14-5).

[20] Lloyd (1992: 14).

of Odysseus and Aias in the *Hoplon Krisis* (pp. 55-6).[21] Even if the *agon* in tragedy pre-existed the *Palamedes*, it is entirely possible that this is the first occasion of an *agon* staged within a trial.

The impact that this on-stage trial would have on the audience is worth examining, since although the stage is set in a mythical environment, it is close to fifth-century practices and the Athenians had a special interest in law practice. Trials for treason, like the one found in the *Palamedes*, were not uncommon in Athens both before and after Aischylos, and the *Myrmidones* could also have included elements pertaining to a treason trial (cf. pp. 119-20). MacDowell notes that there was no fixed penalty for cases of betrayal and the court would decide whether the accused would be exiled or put to death.[22] In the case of the latter, he could not be buried in Attica and his property would be confiscated. In the years between 479 and 338 B.C. forty-six generals were impeached, often for treason or bribery, according to evidence gathered by Roberts.[23] This would be one in twenty generals that served Athens during that period, though not all of them were guilty and not all were convicted.[24] Most of the generals accused of treason were tried through the *eisangelia* process and this rarely ended in acquittal.[25]

---

[21] Duchemin (1968: 50-5), who notes lost plays of Aischylos where an *agon* could have taken place, does not mention the *Palamedes* among these plays.

[22] MacDowell (1978: 176-7).

[23] Roberts (1976: 178; 180-1).

[24] Roberts (1976: 180). Roberts (*ibid.*: 35-41) gives the example of Kimon in 463 B.C., when, on his return from Thasos, he was impeached on false accusations of treason and bribery but was acquitted because of his immense popularity.

[25] Roberts (1976: 187; 190). For the establishment and the use of the *eisangelia* for the punishment of treacherous generals in fifth-century Athens, see the discussion in pp. 119-20.

Bers notes that the audience would take pleasure in the presentation of this familiar legal procedure retrojected back to the heroic era.[26] But there would be more to this than pleasure. The Athenians would have an opportunity to look objectively at the nature of political trials and to question the fairness of the process. This would be again a matter of drawing the world of the heroes closer to that of the audience and allowing them to empathize more.

It is clear that the accusation of treason in the *Palamedes* is false and serves the ulterior motives of the accuser. But as in Athenian life, so in Athenian tragedy, this was a realistic possibility. The Athenian audience would have even come across cases in real life when the accusations of treason against a general had been fabricated by the accusers, motivated by personal or political antagonisms. Not all of these generals would have been as fortunate, or as popular, as Kimon was in 463 B.C., to achieve their acquittal. This could be interesting for an audience that would know of the weak sides of their legal system, occasionally allowing the condemnation of innocent people. As a result, Odysseus acts in tragedy as a corrupt Athenian would, having decided to destroy a political enemy by organising his legal extermination through accusations concerning his services as a general in an *eisangelia*. In tragedy, Palamedes is clearly destroyed in the way an Athenian general of the fifth-century would be and not through the more personal, and less political, plot which we find in earlier mythological versions. This is clear because of the political accusation used to prosecute him, the legal procedure

[26] Bers (1994: 183).

followed, and the potential danger he constitutes for a political opponent because of his increasingly imperative impact on the collective.

Phthonos and political power

Clearly the concealed motive of the prosecutor, in this case, is *phthonos*. Walcot discusses *phthonos* as a motivating and shaping force in fifth-century politics, often taking the form of trials with sycophantic accusations or using ostrasicm[27] as the expression of an undefined but widespread envy for a man who is, annoyingly for some, above average.[28] Ancient writers often spot this motivation as the reason for the fall of charismatic individuals: Ploutarchos notes it in his biographies of illustrious men and elsewhere repeatedly (*Per.* 13.9-11; *Arist.* 7.2; 7.5-6; *Cim.* 16.4; 17.2; *Alc.* 13.4). Reading the biographies of Ploutarchos, one realises how *phthonos* repeatedly led to the destruction of some of the most important politicians and generals of antiquity and influenced the course of historical events. Euripides and Pindar are also aware that great success can bring *phthonos* (E. *Med.* 293-305; Pi. *P.* 7.17-9).

Aischylos, by creating a new source of conflict between two powerful men of the Achaean army in the *Palamedes* and a novel solution, is responding to the political environment of his era and incorporating the new political '*ethos*', or the lack of it, into his work. He is transforming a traditional story of revenge into a corrupt striving for political domination and power. Goldhill has noted how the surviving tragic plays resist staging emotions such as envy, spite and jealousy, except briefly and in the

[27] Fordsyke (2000: 256) speaks of a flurry of ostracisms in the 480s B.C.

[28] Walcot (1978: 52-66).

context of rhetorical battles.[29] Perhaps the case was not as Goldhill suggests with some of the lost plays, the Aischylean *Palamedes* being an example. A feeling such as *phthonos* could occasionally take central stage, since it could be easily paralleled with the real-life experiences of the audience and was evident enough as a political and social problem to be spotted by other writers of the time.

Nauplios and the latter part of the play

Nauplios' presence in the Achaean camp would probably be an important part of the play. *TrGF* iii fr 181, presenting Nauplios asking the reason for the death of his son, would probably come after *TrGF* iii frs. **181a and *182, where Palamedes enumerates his inventions. Aischylos does have an insistence on bringing the parents of dead children on stage, judging from the presence of Niobe, Thetis and Eos. But did Nauplios in this case come knowing what had happened, or did he get there by chance only to find himself in the middle of the crisis? How could he be informed so quickly and sail to Troy? Could he be called for, or informed of, the trial and arrived only too late? The tragedy of Euripides offers an answer to the latter question: the father was informed of the news by his other son, Oiax, with a message on oars (cf. *TrGF* v fr. 588a).[30] It is possible that Aischylos did not give a specific explanation as he is less

[29] Goldhill (2003: 178).

[30] Aristophanes makes a parody of this in *Thesmophoriazousai* 765ff. (Mnesilochos, when unmasked and captured, writes a message on votive tablets instead of oars, as Oiax had done in Euripides' *Palamedes*). See the discussion in Rau (1967: 51-3).

precise in details of the kind.[31] A sudden arrival would be more awkward in mid play, but it may remind us of the arrival of Aigeus in the *Medeia*.[32]

There was probably a second debate involving Nauplios either with Odysseus, Agamemnon or somebody else as his interlocutor. There could even have been a question about the burial of Palamedes. A traitor in Athens, if tried and condemned, would not be allowed burial in Attica in the fifth century (cf. p. 256). Traitors, such as Polyneikes, were not allowed burial in tragedy, either (cf. pp. 84-5). It is difficult to see how the burial issue could have been ignored by Palamedes' enemies, who considered him a traitor, or by his father, who is definitely on stage to defend the memory of his son. If so, then the case would be similar to that of Aias, possibly in the *Threissai* and certainly in the *Aias*. Nauplios may have had a similar role to that of Teukros in the *Aias*. Aischylos was interested not only in the death of Palamedes and the injustice done to him, but in his reputation and perhaps the punishment of those who were guilty. The presence of Nauplios would also allow powerful scenes and lament, possibly exacerbated by his father's surprise, if he actually arrives in ignorance.

Date and trilogy

The only indication that we have for dating this play is suggested by Wilamowitz with reference to the word *taxiarchia*, found in *TrGF* iii *fr. 182, but it can only serve as a

[31] See Dion 52 and 59, for omission of detail in his *Philoktetes* in relation to that of Euripides (cf. pp. 232-3).

[32] Mastronarde (2002: 282-3) notes the criticism of Aristoteles (*Po.* 1461b 19-21) for this unprepared entry and discusses the dramatic advantages of the scene.

vague *terminus post quem*,[33] since the exact date of the institution is difficult to establish.[34]

There have been many suggestions for the trilogy that could accommodate the play.[35] It is not inconceivable that Aischylos wrote a trilogy on the story of the hero or that it was part of a trilogy which incorporated other episodes from the Trojan War, but there is no actual evidence for this.

Reception of the Palamedes in tragedy

Sophokles and Euripides both wrote tragedies with the title *Palamedes* and both appear to follow the trial version that would evidently appeal to the Athenians. It is important to note that Palamedes' inventions in the homonymous play of Sophokles (*TrGF* iv frs. 478-81) are mentioned in the third person (*TrGF* iv fr. 479), and in combination with a line from Servius (schol. *Aeneid* 8.21) this could be indicative of events in this play. The line in question reads: *Tunc Ulixes cum se Palamedi adesse simularet, ait.* As noted by others, this fragment was perhaps spoken by Odysseus, who pretended to be siding with Palamedes.[36]

If this actually happened, then Odysseus must have done it in order to hide his personal resentment. In Sophokles, then, the prosecutor is not Odysseus. That leaves us with

[33] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1893: 88, n. 29).

[34] See Hansen (1991: 106), who does not give an exact date for this institution.

[35] Zielinski (1925: 250; Ferrari (1982: 154); Welcker (1839: 2); Szarmach (1974b: 195); Zografou-Lyra (1987: 188.)

[36] See Szarmach (1974b: 201); Scodel (1980: 53).

Agamemnon as the most probable choice. In this case Agamemnon would be presented as the victim of Odysseus' manipulations, and his only responsibility would be that he is persuaded by Odysseus and the latter's fabricated evidence. Odysseus is once more a manipulator, as in the Sophoklean *Philoktetes*. The trial acquires an additional interest from the double role played by Odysseus, who pretends to be a defender while he is actually the one who created all the evidence used by the prosecution. The fact that Odysseus holds this double role could be indicative of a need to go a step further in a story already told by Aischylos, and could point to the competition among fifth-century poets.[37] The third person narration does not allow us to conclude whether the trial was presented on stage or narrated.

On the line of reconstruction offered here for Sophokles and Aischylos, there is a similarity in their treatment of Palamedes and Aias. Their stories about the two heroes seem to present the same response by an innocent and important man, who is under some kind of attack, the same premise of manipulation, and the same sympathy towards these tragic figures who will eventually lose their lives.

Euripides

The *Palamedes* of Euripides was presented in 415 B.C. The surviving fragments are *TrGF* v frs. 578-90. The main lines of the argument are very much the same as in the

[37] Sophokles, moreover, wrote a play entitled *Odysseus Mainomenos* (*TrGF* iv frs. 462-7) on the revelation of Odysseus' feigned madness, and two plays entitled *Nauplios* (*TrGF* iv frs. 425-38); a *Katapleon* and a *Pyrkaeus*, apparently presenting the two different forms of the revenge of Palamedes' father. See also Sutton (1984: 80-3) for the two plays on Nauplios.

two former tragedies. The motives, the means and the outcome are the same. There are, however, differences. An important twist in the plot is that Odysseus creates a whole conspiracy theory to persuade Agamemnon that Palamedes, together with Achilleus, is after his authority over the army, and Agamemnon consciously collaborates in the destruction of the hero to stop an imminent *coup d'état* (Philostr. *Her.* 33.24).[38] This, as a result, makes the play, as Dion might say, more *politikon.* In Euripides Agamemnon is therefore guiltier than he is in Aischylos or Sophokles, but again he is manipulated by Odysseus. This could be another effort to surpass previous tragic trial versions of the story.

The trial and the *agon* would probably be an important part of the play, where the hero would apparently defend himself unsuccessfully. After his stoning, Oiax, the brother of Palamedes, informs the audience of the death of the hero in a *rhesis.*[39] Oiax writes what happened to Palamedes on oars and sends the message to his father, Nauplios. Oiax has to some extent replaced the Aischylean Nauplios in taking over the action after the death of the hero.

The *Palamedes* of Euripides formed the second part of a trilogy consisting of the *Alexandros* and the *Troades.*[40] Odysseus is mentioned in the *Troades*, as well, and although he is victorious in the *Palamedes*, yet the *Troades* following the *Palamedes*

[38] See discussion in Aélion i (1983: 55); Szarmach (1975: 264-5).

[39] Szarmach (1975: 268-9).

[40] Barlow (1981: 26-7) suggests that the *Alexandros* presented the story of how Paris was exposed at birth after an oracle that he would become the ruin of Troy.

presents him in a very negative light. This happens (although he is never present on stage) by the results of his actions.[41] This could direct us into thinking that there was some kind of criticism of his behaviour in the trilogy.

It is noteworthy that, whereas the three great tragedians all wrote on the story, in Roman theatre there is no evidence for a play on Palamedes. Perhaps it was its predominantly legal nature and the employment of specific Athenian procedures that found fewer followers in Rome than in Athens of the fifth century. Or, alternatively, Palamedes was perhaps less appealing to Romans, as an intellectual hero, than the more traditional heroic Aias, for example, was.

[41] See Scodel (1980: 118) and note E. *Tr.* 1223-5.

Telephos

In the epic cycle we only come across Telephos' name in the summary of the *Kypria*,[1] where the Achaeans attack Teuthrania thinking it was Ilion, and the hero fights against them, kills Thersandros and is wounded by Achilleus (*PEG argumentum* 37-38: Τήλεφος δὲ ἐκβοηθεῖ Θέρσανδρόν τε τὸν Πολυνείκους κτείνει καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπὸ Ἀχιλλέως τιτρώσκεται).[2] He then gets an oracle to go to Argos, where he is healed and shows the Achaeans the way to Troy (*PEG argumentum* 41-2: ἔπειτα Τήλεφον κατὰ μαντείαν παραγενόμενον εἰς Ἄργος ἰᾶται Ἀχιλλεὺς ὡς ἡγεμόνα γενησόμενον τοῦ ἐπ' Ἴλιον πλοῦ). From the scholiast on *Il.* 1.59 (*PEG* fr. 22.1-4) it seems that he promised not to help the Trojans, was then healed by Achilleus and showed the Achaeans the way to Troy:

> Τήλεφος δὲ ἀνίατον ἔχων τὸ τραῦμα, εἰπόντος θεοῦ μηδένα δύνασθαι αὐτὸν θεραπεῦσαι ἢ τὸν τρώσαντα, ἦλθεν εἰς Ἄργος, καὶ πίστιν δοὺς μὴ ἐπικουρήσειν Τρωσὶν ἐθεραπεύθη ὑπὸ Ἀχιλλέως καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδειξε τὸν ἐπὶ Ἴλιον πλοῦ.

There is no mention of Telephos in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and in the former it is Kalchas who guides the Achaeans to Troy (*Il.* 1.70-2).[3] In the Hesiodic *Katalogos* there is also a reference to the fights at Teuthrania (fr. 165.14-5 MW), and it is probable that the wounding and healing of the hero were also narrated. A papyrus of

[1] Bernabé (1987: 43) dates it in the seventh century B.C.; Davies (1989: 3-4) dates it in the fifth century B.C.

[2] Preiser (2001: 277-86) discusses the healing of Telephos as found in several sources.

[3] See Jouan (1966: 292), for a discussion on whether Homer implied the wounding of Telephos and the battle at Mysia in *Il.* 1.59-61. Note that Kirk (1985: 59) sees no such implications in the passage.

Archilochos was recently published (P. Oxy. 4708 frs. 1-8) which deals with the middle stage of Telephos' story, the battle against the Achaeans at Mysia.[4]

Apollodoros, whose version seems to be close to the epic one, says that Telephos went to Argos after an oracle revealed that he would be healed by the one who wounded him, and there he promised to show the way to Troy in return for his healing. The route which Telephos indicated was verified by Kalchas (*Epit.* 3.19-20). Interestingly, in Apollodoros the role of verification is assigned to Kalchas, as if he were trying to combine the Homeric tradition with the tradition that saw Telephos as the guide. As attested by the scholiasts on the *Iliad* (schol. *Il.* 1.59; schol. *Il.* 1.71; *PEG Kypria* fr. 22.4-7) it was the *neoteroi* who had Telephos taking up this role.

Iconography offers an indication that there was a supplication attested in the tradition of Telephos' story as early as the 470s B.C. An Attic red-figure cup, now in Boston (*LIMC* Telephos 51), the work of the Telephos painter and signed by the potter Hieron, presents the hero sitting alone at an altar holding two javelins. The setting is the palace of Agamemnon, who is depicted sitting on his throne, while Kalchas is speaking to Telephos. Achilleus is drawing his sword against Telephos and Patroklos is trying to stop him. Csapo and others date the vase to the 470s B.C. and suggest that it probably depicts epic tradition.[5] The date, however, does not necessarily point to epos. It could

[4] Obbink (2005: 18-21).

[5] Csapo (1990: 44-5); Caskey and Beazley iii (1963: 54-6); Schettino Nobile (1969: 41) date the vase between 470-460 and see the influence of the *Kypria* on it. See, furthermore, Heres and Strauss *LIMC* vii (1994: 866).

be the influence of anything from epos to early tragedy,[6] or it could even be the influence of non-literary sources.

Aischylos' Telephos

The *Telephos* is attested in the Catalogue of Aischylean plays. Only three fragments, in all three lines, survive from this play (*TrGF* iii frs. 238-40). Not much can be discerned from the fragments apart from the fact that Agamemnon is one of the characters of the play as *TrGF* iii fr. *238 attests. The speaker, probably Telephos, is addressing Agamemnon with respect and in a formal way:

κύδιστ' Ἀχαιῶν Ἀτρέως πολυκοίρανε μάνθανέ μου παῖ [7]

TrGF iii fr. *239 is spoken by Telephos:

ΤΗΛ. ἁπλῆ γὰρ οἶμος εἰς Ἅιδου φέρει

TrGF iii fr. 240 is of lexicographical interest. There is, however, a *testimonium* that can be of some help. A scholion on Aristophanes (schol. *Ach.* 332) reads:

> τὰ δὲ μεγάλα πάθη ὑποπαίζει τῆς τραγῳδίας, ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ Τήλεφος κατὰ τὸν τραγῳδοποιὸν †Αἰσχύλον, ἵνα τύχῃ παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησι σωτηρίας, τὸν Ὀρέστην εἶχε συλλαβών. παραπλήσιον δέ τι καὶ ἐν ταῖς Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις ἐποίησεν. ὁ γὰρ Εὐριπίδου κηδεστὴς Μνησίλοχος, ἐπιβουλευόμενος παρὰ τῶν γυναικῶν, ἀσκὸν ἁρπάσας παρά τινος γυναικός, ὡς ἂν παιδίον ἀποκτεῖναι βούλεται.

[6] Lyric poetry also treated the story, although there are no details, at least in what survives, of Telephos' healing by Achilleus (cf. Pi. *I.* 5.41; 8.49; *O.* 9.72).

[7] The translation of the fragment by Weir-Smyth (1926: 462) reads: "Most glorious of the Achaeans, wide-ruling son of Atreus, learn of me!"

This suggests that, in the play of Aischylos, Telephos seized Orestes and held him while supplicating at the altar. The language used in the case of Aischylos (ἵνα τύχῃ παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησι σωτηρίας, τὸν Ὀρέστην εἶχε συλλαβών) is different from the language used in the description of the scene in Aristophanes (ὡς ἂν παιδίον ἀποκτεῖναι βούλεται). The reference to Aischylos implies no violence against the child and no kind of threat for his life. Telephos simply holds the boy in order to achieve his salvation. This is unlike the clear indication in Aristophanes that the child is in danger.

The presence of the young Orestes in the play of Aischylos has been often dismissed and the scholion considered to be merely confusion with the homonymous plays of Euripides; the latter's play included a scene where Telephos threatens Orestes at the altar. This was made famous by Aristophanes' parody in the *Acharneis* and the *Thesmophoriazousai*. However, if the scholion is actually correct, then Euripides apparently imitated a scene that was to be found in the Aischylean play from which nothing has survived. The scholion is not enough to allow us to draw conclusions about the existence of such a scene before the 438 B.C. *Telephos* of Euripides.

Iconography offers a possible indication of the veracity of the information of this otherwise tentative scholion. There is the case of the London pelike of c. 460-450 B.C. (*LIMC* Telephos 52/Agamemnon 11), which depicts Telephos with Orestes at the altar but without any traces of threat against the child. The date of the vase is important, as

it does not allow the possibility for influence by Euripides' *Telephos* (438 B.C.).[8] The date, moreover, is not the only problem with assigning the vase to the Euripidean *Telephos* of 438 B.C. This distinctive presentation of Telephos with Orestes is different from those found on later vases which show the influence of Euripides' tragedy, with Telephos threatening the infant at the altar. On the London Pelike the hero holds a spear in an upright, non-threatening way,[9] as in the vase where he is alone (*LIMC* Telephos 51), and unlike the sword he is holding on the vases where he is threatening Orestes (*LIMC* Telephos 53-80). The date and image of this vase suggests that the motif of Telephos with the child near an altar was present before Euripides' *Telephos* in a similar depiction but with important differences.

The details of the motif on the London Pelike point to a supplication, not a threat. How else can we explain the fact that Orestes is in the hands of Telephos near an altar with no traces of violence? If so, then this supplication existed in the story of Telephos as early as the 460s-450s B.C. The supplication itself may not have been completely new to the story of Telephos since there is the possibility that Telephos supplicated in tradition without the child before the 470s B.C. (cf. *LIMC* Telephos 51).

This form of supplication, with the suppliant holding the child of the man one supplicates, without any threat to the child's life, was not unknown in the fifth century

[8] Beazley (1963: 632). See Caskey and Beazley iii (1963: 56), who date the vase no later than the mid-fifth century; Touchefeu and Krauskopf *LIMC* i (1981: 260); Schettino Nobile (1969: 43) dates the vase to 460-450 B.C.; Green and Handley (1995: 38); Csapo (1990: 44) date the vase to the 450s.

[9] Small (2003: 66).

B.C. There was a form of supplication known to Athenians of the classical period that involved actual physical contact with a close relative of the person supplicated.[10] There are cases in antiquity where this form of supplication is mentioned; one such example is the story of Themistokles (Th. 136.2-137.1):

> ἀναγκάζεται (sc. Themistokles) κατά τι ἄπορον παρὰ Ἄδμητον τὸν Μολοσσῶν βασιλέα ὄντα αὐτῷ οὐ φίλον καταλῦσαι. καὶ ὁ μὲν οὐκ ἔτυχεν ἐπιδημῶν, ὁ δὲ τῆς γυναικὸς ἱκέτης γενόμενος διδάσκεται ὑπ' αὐτῆς τὸν παῖδα σφῶν λαβὼν καθέζεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν ἑστίαν [...] ὁ δὲ (sc. Admetos) ἀκούσας ἀνίστησί τε αὐτὸν μετὰ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ υἱέος (ὥσπερ καὶ ἔχων αὐτὸν ἐκαθέζετο, καὶ μέγιστον ἦν ἱκέτευμα τοῦτο).

The same story is also found in Ploutarchos (*Them.* 24.2-3):

> ἱκέτης (sc. Themistokles) τοῦ Ἀδμήτου καταστὰς ἴδιόν τινα καὶ παρηλλαγμένον τρόπον. ἔχων γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν υἱὸν ὄντα παῖδα πρὸς τὴν ἑστίαν προσέπεσε, ταύτην μεγίστην καὶ μόνην σχεδὸν ἀναντίρρητον ἡγουμένων ἱκεσίαν τῶν Μολοσσῶν. ἔνιοι μὲν οὖν Φθίαν τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ βασιλέως λέγουσιν ὑποθέσθαι τῷ Θεμιστοκλεῖ τὸ ἱκέτευμα τοῦτο καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἐπὶ τὴν ἑστίαν καθίσαι μετ' αὐτοῦ· τινὲς δ' αὐτὸν τὸν Ἄδμητον, ὡς ἀφοσιώσαιτο πρὸς τοὺς διώκοντας τὴν ἀνάγκην, δι' ἣν οὐκ ἐκδίδωσι τὸν ἄνδρα, διαθεῖναι καὶ συντραγῳδῆσαι τὴν ἱκεσίαν.

[10] Csapo (1990: 50).

In this case, the son is the pledge or symbol of the suppliant's proper treatment.[11] Csapo believes that in the cases of both Themistokles and Telephos we come across what he calls the *megiston hiketeuma.*[12] This would be the physical analogue of verbal references to the closest relatives of the man one supplicates, a motif that we often meet in supplications.[13] Apparently this was an acknowledged way to arouse the feeling of pity for the one supplicated. The language used in the sources concerning Themistokles is very similar to the language in the scholia on Aristophanes for the scene in Aischylos and it also describes adequately what we see on the London Pelike (Th. 136.2-137.1: τὸν παῖδα σφῶν λαβὼν καθέζεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν ἑστίαν; ἔχων αὐτὸν ἐκαθέζετο; Plu. *Them.* 24.2-3: ἔχων γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν υἱὸν ὄντα παῖδα πρὸς τὴν ἑστίαν προσέπεσε; ἐπὶ τὴν ἑστίαν καθίσαι μετ' αὐτοῦ).

The vase could have been inspired or could have existed independently but parallel to a text relating Telephos with this form of supplication. The play of Aischylos, the only text for which it is suggested that it included a scene that can be seen as a supplication, could have presented the same story in the first half of the fifth century. This does not necessarily mean that the play of Aischylos was the inspiration for the vase or that this is a case where theatrical influences on iconography can be securely spotted. There is not enough evidence to connect the vase to this play directly and categorically.[14]

---

[11] Gould (1973: 100).

[12] Csapo (1990: 49; 52); Séchan (1926: 127).

[13] Csapo (1990: 49-51) gives many examples such as *Il.* 22.338 and E. *Med.* 324.

[14] According to Moret (1975: 264-5), the Telephos motif was an iconographic *koine* with borrowings from both literary and figurative sources; a figurative language that the successive versions of the poets

Nevertheless, even if the vase and the play were mutually independent, both prove that Orestes was not inserted in the story by Euripides but sometime before 460-450 B.C. and in a different role. As a result, the scholion involving Orestes in Aischylos' *Telephos* need not be wrong.

What is important in the references to the story of Themistokles is the reading of the supplication as a distinctly Molossian form of appeal (Plu. *Them.* 24.2-3: ταύτην μεγίστην καὶ μόνην σχεδὸν ἀναντίρρητον ἡγουμένων ἱκεσίαν τῶν Μολοσσῶν). The supplication was apparently in accordance with the Athenian knowledge of fifth-century Molossian practices and, in general, with the Athenian familiarity with contemporary barbarian populations, or rather populations on the outskirts of the Greek world who had a claim to Hellenicity, such as the Molossians, who were living in Epirus, or the Macedonians.[15]

A similar supplication is attested for a Macedonian family in Aischines 2.28-9. Amyntas died and left the throne to one of his three young sons, Alexandros, who was soon assassinated. Eurydike, the mother of the children, the other two being Perdikkas and Philippos, took the throne with her lover Ptolemaios but her authority was threatened by Pausanias (cf. schol. Aischines 2.54; 60-61). She asked for the help of

---

transformed, but on the formation of which the workshop traditions played a determining role. See, also, Small (2003: 66).

[15] Lloyd (1994: 1-2); J. Hall (2002: 165-6); Hall (1989: 180-1); (2002: 145); Allan (2000: 152); Malkin (2001: 201-2). The Molossians were occasionally considered to be descendants of Neoptolemos (cf. *PEG Nostoi argumentum* 13-6; Pi. *N.* 7.38-40). See, further, discussion in Carey (1981: 152). The *Andromache* (Molossians) and the *Archelaos* (Macedonians) of Euripides were probably plays written with the objective to empower the claim of these peoples to Hellenicity. See Hall (1989: 181).

Iphikrates, who was an old friend of her husband by supplicating him in a way that recalls the *megiston hiketeuma*:

> μετεπέμψατο αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ ἡ σή (sc.Eurydike), καὶ ὥς γε δὴ λέγουσιν οἱ παρόντες πάντες, Περδίκκαν μὲν τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν σὸν καταστήσασα εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τὰς Ἰφικράτους, σὲ δὲ εἰς τὰ γόνατα τὰ ἐκείνου θεῖσα παιδίον ὄντα, εἶπεν [. . .] καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἤδη δέησιν ἰσχυρὰν ἐποιεῖτο καὶ ὑπὲρ αὑτῆς καὶ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ ὅλως ὑπὲρ τῆς σωτηρίας. ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα Ἰφικράτης, ἐξήλασε Παυσανίαν ἐκ Μακεδονίας καὶ τὴν δυναστείαν ὑμῖν ἔσωσε.

In the example from Macedonia, the children of the suppliant are again used to arouse the feeling of the man supplicated and they are placed in his hands, not in the hands of the suppliant. The mother is once more present with an energetic role, as she is in the example from Molossia: she places her children in the hands of the man supplicated.

The use of this characteristic supplication in all three cases is related to a barbarian nation (Mysians in tragedy) or to nations with a controversial -barbarian or Hellenic- origin (Molossians and Macedonians in history). Taking into account these historical parallels, Aischylos' use of the motif can be better understood in the context of a tendency to assign fifth-century Athenian characteristics to mythical figures with Greek origin or fifth-century barbarian characteristics to signal the different origin of non-Greek characters. Aischylos is once again blending myth and historical reality, in an effort to make the traditional stories more realistic and more recognisable for his audience.

At first sight, in the play the barbarian character brings his customs to a non-barbarian environment, whereas in the story with Themistokles, a non-barbarian character adopts the customs of a barbarian environment. In both cases, this barbarian custom brings the two parties closer. It becomes a bridge between civilizations, while preserving their differences, and a link between the mythical era and the fifth century. But with a closer look, one realises that Telephos is himself a link between the Greeks and the barbarians, as he is half-Greek and half-barbarian. He is on the margin of the two worlds, as are both the Molossians and the Macedonians in the fifth-century. Telephos is, therefore, a most appropriate hero to be connected to the characteristic supplication tradition of this – for some barbarian, for others Greek - world. The choice to relate Telephos to this *megiston hiketeuma* could even hide political connotations related to Aischylos' views on the origin of the people who historically performed this sort of supplication.

The supplication in the play would probably be enacted on stage. *TrGF* iii fr. *238 could be the address of Telephos to Agamemnon in the process of this supplication. There are several on-stage supplications in Greek tragedy, some of which are the focal point of the whole play.[16] Aischylos staged supplications in other occasions such as the *Hiketides*[17] and the *Eumenides*.[18] He probably staged one in the *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra*, as well (cf. p. 149). The two surviving examples of supplication in the Aischylean corpus show that the poet used variations of the motif. A characteristic

[16] Taplin (1977: 192-3; 198-9; 215; 409) discusses the supplication as a story-pattern in tragedy.

[17] See discussion in Taplin (1977: 198-9).

[18] See discussion in Sommerstein (1989: 123-4).

difference, for example, is that in the *Hiketides* the suppliants are the chorus of the play, whereas in the *Eumenides* the pursuers form the chorus. A supplication in the *Telephos* could be in line with the suppliant story-pattern but at the same time inventive; the use of Orestes could be one of the novel elements inserted. This supplication could serve as an identifiably fifth-century way of showing that Telephos supplicated in a way that he could not be refused by his pursuers and it would probably arouse the pity of the audience more than a simple supplication without the child would.

Telephos and Themistokles

The supplication story from the life of Themistokles has often been directly associated with the supplication motif of the *Telephos* of Aischylos.[19] There have been suggestions that the real life event of Themistokles' life was taken up by tragedy.[20] The defenders of this view often assign to Aischylos a desire to vindicate the politician who was expelled from Athens.[21] They read this scene as propaganda, a practice often attributed to the Athenian theatre and Aischylos in particular. The latter is often charged with pro-Themistoklean propaganda, as the *Hiketides* and the *Persai* have been considered by some as attempts to vindicate Themistokles.[22]

[19] Séchan (1926: 124; 126); Aélion i (1983: 33); Hornblower i (1991: 220); Csapo (1990: 47); Preiser (2000a: 53-4) for a detailed analysis and correlation of the two cases.

[20] Csapo (1990: 48); Séchan (1926: 124); Gomme (1945: 438).

[21] Csapo (1990: 52); Séchan (1926: 124).

[22] Sommerstein (1993: 69); Cavaignac (1921: 102-6); Forrest (1960: 240); Podlecki (1966: 52; 55; 57).

There is, of course, the uncertainty as to which of the two occurrences of the motif predates the other.[23] Themistokles' flight to Adrastos is usually dated between the years 471 and 466/5 B.C.[24] Apparently, the supplication of Themistokles to Adrastos has been considered by those who see Aischylos as replicating an event from the life of the politician as a possible *terminus post quem* for the tragedy.[25] (Dating the play after Themistokles' flight would not necessarily politicise the play; the political events might have simply informed the Athenians of the existence of this tradition in Molossia.) But one should be hesitant to date the play on the basis of a tentative connection between history and theatre.

There is no actual indication for the date of the play. The London pelike of 460-450 B.C. (*LIMC* Telephos 52) can only be used to prove that a supplication scene with Orestes was known before the tragedy of Euripides, and cannot possibly help us in dating the play, as no connection between the play and the vase can be securely established.

There have been several suggestions concerning the trilogy that would include this play.[26] For lack of evidence, however, the possibility of an unconnected trilogy should be allowed.

---

[23] Aélion i (1983: 33) notes the difficulty of deciding what came first.

[24] Forrest (1960: 226); Hornblower and Spawforth (1998: 710).

[25] Csapo (1990: 52); Séchan (1926: 124).

[26] See Mette (1963: 77); Ferrari (1982: 154).

The reworking of the supplication by Euripides

As attested in the second argument of his *Alkestis*, Euripides presented his homonymous tragedy in 438 B.C. as part of the unconnected tetralogy *Kretes*, *Alkmeon ho dia Psophidos*, *Telephos* and *Alkestis*. The surviving fragments of the play (*TrGF* v frs. 696-727c) and the *testimonia* (*TrGF testimonia* ia-va), among which is the *hypothesis*, first edited by Turner (P. Oxy. 2455 fr. 12), are helpful.[27] Several detailed reconstructions have been attempted for Euripides' *Telephos*.[28]

In Euripides, Telephos entered the palace disguised in rags (*TrGF* v frs. 697-698 and 703),[29] and then seized and threatened Orestes. Klytaimnestra was the one who suggested that he should take the child of her husband,[30] whom she hated after the death of Iphigeneia (*TrGF* v fr. 727).[31] Menelaos and Agamemnon have a confrontation, the cause of which is unclear (*TrGF* v frs. 722-3). Agamemnon consents

[27] Turner (1962a: 41); Austin (1968: 67); Kannicht (2004: 681). See also Turner (1962b: 87-100), for papyrus fragments of the Euripidean *Telephos*.

[28] See Séchan (1926: 512-8); Aélion i (1983: 36); Handley and Rea (1957: 28-39); Ditifeci (1984: 210-8); Heath (1987: 277-80); March (1998: 371); Preiser (2000a: 71ff.).

[29] Collard, Cropp and Lee (1995: 23) note the disguise as a Euripidean innovation. In Apollodoros' version Telephos is also disguised (*Epit.* 3.20).

[30] The presence of a woman in the story of Themistokles in Molossia, Amyntas' wife in Macedonia, and the presence of Klytaimnestra in Euripides' *Telephos* cannot be considered secure proof for the presence of the mother in the Aischylean play, however tempting this might be.

[31] See Preiser (2000b: 35), for a discussion on whether the motif of the sacrifice of Iphigeneia was included in the play.

to the blackmail in order to save his child,[32] Odysseus explains the oracle, and he is the one who persuades the unwilling Achilleus to heal Telephos (perhaps *TrGF* v fr. 719).[33]

On the vast majority of the vases with Telephos (*LIMC* Telephos 53-80), the hero is threatening to kill Orestes with his sword while Agamemnon comes running to save his son, usually holding a sword. The scene on the vases that are connected with the Euripidean tragedy is violent, in contradistinction to the London pelike (*LIMC* Telephos 52), as noted earlier. The difference is apparently due to two different versions of the same story. Euripides presents the transformation of the motif that we find on the London pelike and in Aischylos as a supplication to a form of blackmail.

This allows no space for respect between Agamemnon and Telephos and no place for, at least temporary, reconciliation between the two enemies and could point to a degradation of the *ethos* of the characters. This play might be a good example of the accusation of Aischylos towards Euripides on how he transformed the heroes in his plays (cf. Ar. *Ra.* 1011: ἐκ χρηστῶν καὶ γενναίων μοχθηροτάτους ἀπέδειξας). It is plausible that the audience would consider this blackmail having in mind the original motif of the supplication, as they would have known it from Aischylos, iconography and perhaps additional sources. The blackmail scene would probably

[32] Small (2003: 66) suggests that there is no evidence to prove whether the supplication scene would take place on stage or would be narrated. The narration is considered more probable by Handley and Rea (1957: 37); Gould (1973: 101-3). Contra, see Rau (1967: 25); Taplin (1987: 103); Heath (1987: 275).

[33] The threat motif is also used by Euripides in the *Orestes*. For an audience which remembered the *Telephos*, the hostage taking in the *Orestes* of 408 B.C. would have a cerain irony. See the discussion on the correlation of the two cases in Porter (1994: 87-8).

make an impression and stay on the audience's minds exactly because it would be a surprise. Euripides apparently needed a way of making his version appealing, as in other cases too, by giving it a novel and spanking new element that would make a difference.[34]

There is also a realistic touch that Euripides brings to the story, as he does in several other cases: he dresses his hero in rags as a beggar to enter the camp unnoticed and he is repeatedly mocked for this choice; the rags become a *cliché* for the Euripidean heroes that Aristophanes picks up (cf. Ar. *Ra.* 1060-4).[35]

Aristophanes' reading of the Euripidean Telephos

Whatever the reasons were for inserting the perversion of the Aischylean scene, Euripides gave to another great poet a tremendous inspiration. This scene was to become one of Aristophanes' greatest parodies of tragedy. In the *Acharneis* (425 B.C.), Dikaiopolis seizes a coal basket and threatens to kill it in order to be heard and then he puts on the rags of Telephos to evoke the pity of his audience. In the *Thesmophoriazousai* (411 B.C.), Mnesilochos, when unmasked, seizes a child, but in truth a flask of wine, to protect himself. Moreover, one third of the fragments surviving from the *Telephos* come from quotations in the *Acharneis* (425 B.C.), and the play

[34] On the quest for originality in fifth-century tragedy and the competition between the poets, who were repeatedly handling the same stories see p. 311.

[35] Muecke (1982: 19-22) discusses the parody of the rags of Telephos by Aristophanes.

starts and ends with references to this tragedy.[36] Similar is the case with the *Thesmophoriazousai* of 411 B.C.[37] There are, furthermore, at least eighteen references to the *Telephos* in the rest of Aristophanes' comedies and the comedian was citing from this play even fifty years after its original production in his *Ploutos* (388 B.C.).[38]

Apparently the scene of Euripides in which Telephos is threatening the child was one that left an impression on the comedian. Either this, or Aristophanes, being the great comedian that he was, saw the impact of the scene on audiences of Euripides. Was this because it was striking, exaggerated, or was it because it was different in a way that called for laughter? Aristophanes came back to it again and again, and it is worth asking whether it would make the same impression on the comedian, and on his audience, if it were not for the Aischylean tragedy, which presented, in all probability, a completely different attitude on the parts of both Telephos and Agamemnon. Perhaps, it was not simply the version of Euripides that made a difference in 438 B.C. but its divergence from the play of Aischylos. The *Telephos* of Euripides and its extensive reception in the fifth century by comedy is proof of how the work of a poet can be innovative and original even when re-working a theme presented in theatre by an older poet and how the comparison to the second play can be used as an advantage.

Telephos in the rest of Greek drama

[36] See Rau (1967: 26-42), for a detailed discussion and examples.

[37] See discussions in Schlesinger (1936: 310) and (1937: 298); Miller (1948: 174-83); Rau (1967: 42-50).

[38] Schlesinger (1936: 313).

Tragic poets like Iophon (*TrGF* i 22 fr. 2c), Agathon (*TrGF* i 39 fr. 4), Moschion (*TrGF* i 97 fr. 2) and Kleophon (*TrGF* i 77 *testimonium* 1) also wrote a *Telephos*, proving the sort of prominence that the story must have had in antiquity, but nothing survives to help us understand more about their plays. The case is not better with Sophokles. There have been suggestions that Sophokles wrote a tetralogy on Telephos.[39] The existence of a tragedy entitled *Telephos* as part of this supposed tetralogy is not clear, however. There is the suggestion that this title referred to the fourth play of the tetralogy, the satyr drama, and Steffen edits the *Telephos* of Sophokles as a satyr drama, but not all editors do.[40] Moreover, Webster considers that the *Achaion Syllogos* was the title that could accommodate the story of the healing of the hero.[41] The fragments surviving are *TrGF* iv frs. 142-8, but they do not offer any proof for the suggested *hypothesis*. Things are so unclear when it comes to Sophokles and the Telephos story that one should not go any further.

Roman tragedy

Ennius was the first in Rome to write a play on Telephos and his play points to Euripides. The fragments we have attest that his Telephos, like the one by Euripides, is disguised as a merchant (frs. 1a-b Jocelyn). Menelaos seems to be present on stage, as he probably is in Euripides (fr. 4 Jocelyn), and a line by the latter is almost translated

[39] Papagiannopoulos-Palaios (1929: 162; 169) suggests this, based on the inscription mentioning a *Telepheia* for Sophokles. Contra, see the discussion in Radt (1983: 224-6).

[40] Steffen (1952: 206, fr. 121). Arvanitopoulos (1929: 182) notes that the existence of a Greek satyr play entitled *Telephos* is also attested by a Roman inscription. Contra, see Krumeich, Pechstein and Seidensticker (1999) who do not see the title as satyric.

[41] Webster (1936:173); Aélion i (1983: 35); Fromhold-Treu (1934: 332).

(fr. 3 Jocelyn). Ennius is believed to have created a violent Telephos modeled on the Euripidean one.[42]

Accius also wrote a *Telephus*. What we have is not enough to allow us to speculate if Accius' Telephos was a noble character or a violent one. The fragments surviving (frs. 1-15 D'Antó) are not that helpful.[43] The possibility that the Roman poet combined more than one Greek play to create his should also be taken into account, as this was a common method of Roman drama (cf. pp. 315-9). However, the *ethos* of the characters, if it could be retrieved, would help us to distinguish if the play revolved around the supplication or the blackmail motif.

[42] Masia (2000: 546; 563).

[43] D' Antó (1980: 464) suggests Euripidean influence.

Iphigeneia

There is only one line surviving from the *Iphigeneia* of Aishylos and the task of examining this in search of some evidence on how the tragedian treated the theme is, admittedly, unsafe territory. The current study, however, will argue that the meagre evidence is in fact suggestive. In particular it can be argued that the single line of the play points to a female presence and a gender collision, probably to be related to the male decision to sacrifice the girl. It will also be argued that the play was a stage in the development of the figure of Klytaimnestra, as this was to be found in the *Oresteia* of 458 B.C. One should start by examining all other more extant references to the story, before concluding with the single line of the *Iphigeneia* that can only be understood in relation to the rest of tradition.

There seems to be a complete lack of any reaction attested in early tradition simultaneously to the sacrifice of Iphigeneia until one comes across Euripides' *IA*. Agamemnon and, apparently, the army accept Artemis' wish and sacrifice the girl without encountering any form of opposition. There is no trace of resistance or reproach for what seems to have been a male decision in what survives from early tradition. Nevertheless, this creates an obvious question: was there never a voice raised against the sacrifice before the *IA*?[1]

[1] The sacrifice is criticised in the *Oresteia* by Klytaimnestra, and by the male chorus, but this is a retrospective approach.

In the *Kypria*, according to Proklos' summary, the story was as follows (*PEG argumentum* 45-9):

> Κάλχαντος δὲ εἰπόντος τὴν τῆς θεοῦ μῆνιν καὶ Ἰφιγένειαν κελεύσαντος θύειν τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι, ὡς ἐπὶ γάμον αὐτὴν Ἀχιλλεῖ μεταπεμψάμενοι θύειν ἐπιχειροῦσιν. Ἄρτεμις δὲ αὐτὴν ἐξαρπάσασα εἰς Ταύρους μετακομίζει καὶ ἀθάνατον ποιεῖ, ἔλαφον δὲ ἀντὶ τῆς κόρης παρίστησι τῷ βωμῷ.

There is no reference in the short summary of Proklos to Klytaimnestra following her daughter to Aulis, no indication of any female reaction, no opposition to, or reproach of, the male decision. The girl is finally turned into a deity.[2] The condensed nature of the summary allows no further speculation; moreover, the epic nature of the original text is not supportive of the view that any feelings of the protagonists would have been elaborated on.

The *Gynaikon Katalogos* also presented the sacrifice but named the girl Iphimede (fr. 23a MW). Lines 17-26 narrate the story of Iphigeneia/Iphimede, including her rescue, followed by the birth of Orestes and the eventual matricide (ll. 27-30):

> Ἰφιμέδην μὲν σφάξαν ἐυκνή[μ]ιδες Ἀχαιοὶ
> βωμῶ[ι ἔπ' Ἀρτέμιδος χρυσηλακ]ά̲τ[ου] κελαδεινῆς,

[2] The inclusion of the transportation to the Taurid has been doubted by Burnett (1971: 73-5) and Hall (1989: 111), because, in their view the Athenians would have no knowledge of this population in the fifth century. On the other hand, Cropp (2000: 44) suggests that the Taurians would be known to Greek explorers and settlers around the Black sea in the seventh century B.C., and so does Huxley (1969: 136).

ἤματ[ι τῶι ὅτε νηυσὶν ἀνέπλ]εον̲ Ἴλιον ε̲[ἴσω
ποινὴ[ν τεισόμενοι καλλισ]φύρου Ἀργειώ̲[νη]ς̲,
εἴδω[λον· αὐτὴν δ' ἐλαφηβό]λο̲ς ἰοχέαιρα
ῥεῖα μάλ' ἐξεσά[ωσε, καὶ ἀμβροσ]ίην [ἐρ]α̲τε̲[ινὴν
στάξε κατὰ κρῆ[θεν, ἵνα οἱ χ]ρὼ̲ς̲ [ἔ]μ̲πε̲[δ]ο̲[ς] ε̲[ἴη,
θῆκεν δ' ἀθάνατο[ν καὶ ἀγήρ]αον ἦμα[τα πάντα.
τὴν δὴ νῦν καλέο[υσιν ἐπὶ χ]θ̲ονὶ φῦλ' ἀν̲[θρώπων
Ἄρτεμιν εἰνοδί[ην, πρόπολον κλυ]τοῦ ἰ[ο]χ[ε]αίρ[ης.
λοῖσθον δ' ἐν μεγά[ροισι Κλυτ]αιμ̲ή̲στρη κυα[νῶπις
γείναθ' ὑποδμηθ[εῖσ' Ἀγαμέμν]ον[ι δῖ]ον Ὀρέ[στην,
ὅς ῥα καὶ ἡβήσας ἀπε̲[τείσατο π]ατροφο[ν]ῆα,
κτεῖνε δὲ μητέρα [ἣν ὑπερήν]ορα νηλέι [χαλκῶι.

Solmsen suggests that lines 21-26 presenting the girl's salvation are a later addition to the *Katalogos*.[3] The verb σφάξαν that is used in l. 17 for the sacrifice is considered by Solmsen to indicate a degree of completeness that does not allow the intervention by the goddess to save the girl later on in the same passage.[4] But the word is used in another case where Iphigeneia is saved (cf. E. *IT* 8). Klytaimnestra is not referred to the passage and it appears that the girl was at Aulis alone.

Stesichoros also told the story of the sacrifice of Iphigeneia in his *Oresteia*. Although in the *Helene* he made Iphigeneia the daughter of Helene and Theseus (*PMG* 191), yet

[3] Solmsen (1981: 354); Cropp (2000: 44).

[4] Solmsen (1981: 354).

a testimony for his *Oresteia* (*PMG* 215) informs us that Stesichoros followed Hesiod in saying that Iphigeneia, the daughter of Agamemnon, is now called Hekate. This last reference to the transformation of the girl to a deity implies the inclusion of the version in which Artemis saved the girl in the lyric *Oresteia*. The story was apparently narrated in some detail by Stesichoros; in *PMG* 217. 25-7 (in what appears to be an ancient commentary) it is noted that Euripides found the pretext of the marriage with which Iphigeneia was summoned to Aulis in Stesichoros. This leads to the assumption that there was a relatively extensive treatment of Iphigeneia's sacrifice in his *Oresteia*.[5]

Pindar (*P.* 11.22-5) speaks of the death of Iphigeneia and wonders if this was the motive for the acts of Klytaimnestra:

πότερόν νιν ἄρ' Ἰφιγένει' ἐπ' Εὐρίπῳ
σφαχθεῖσα τῆλε πάτρας
ἔκνισεν βαρυπάλαμον ὄρσαι χόλον;
ἢ ἑτέρῳ λέχεϊ δαμαζομέναν
ἔννυχοι πάραγον κοῖται;

The ode is usually dated to 474 B.C.[6] and, as far as we know, this makes Pindar the first to speak of the possibility that the girl was not saved; March suggests that he does this in a way that implies that the audience was familiar with this version.[7] In Pindar, the event is included in past narration and is not elaborated on. Although connected to the murder of Agamemnon, there seems to have been no place for a current reaction of the

[5] March (1987: 87) rejects the idea that this implies any connection to the murder of Agamemnon, because the girl is saved in Stesichoros.

[6] Von der Mühll (1958: 141-6); Race (1997: 366); March (1987: 91); Snell and Maehler (1987: 98).

[7] March (1987: 92).

mother at the time of the sacrifice. Nevertheless, the fact that Pindar briefly refers to the death of the girl and the double motivation of Klytaimnestra as early as 474 B.C. suggests the knowledge of such a version on the part of the audience.

March draws attention to a very interesting papyrus fragment, which includes a commentary on a lyric composition related to Simonides (P. Oxy. 2434 / *PMG* 608 fr. 1 (a) +2) and presents the death version of Iphigeneia's story:[8]

φησι κωκυτὸν̲ [
τούτωι ὁ Σιμω̲[νίδης
νοιτο περὶ του[.]ου̲[
÷ .ν εὐλόγως η παρ . . [
τ̲ον ἐθρήνουν ἐπιο . [
ἔοικεν δαιμονι .[
[ ]. ἑτοῖμοι στ̲ενά[ζ]ε[ιν γ]ὰ̲ρ τ̲ὸ
ὅλον συνημμ[έν- ἂν] γένοι-
το ῥῆσις περὶ τ̲ο[ ] . . .
την σφαζομεν[ ] .ν 10
τὸν λαὸν αὔει .[ ]ν
.ι̲τ' ἐπὶ τὸ ἐναν̲[τίο]ν̲ [. . . . .]. ἐξ-
αλλαγῆι. μητρὶ δὲ ὑπ' οὐδενὸς
ἂν ἡττηθείη ἡ λύπη, ἀναιρου-
μένων δὲ τῶν παί[δων ἑ]τοῖ-
μον στενάζειν. φέρεται [δὲ καὶ] ἄλ-
λη γραφή· ἐμοὶ δὲ τίς ἀμφα. . . ·
πάνυ σαφὴς ἀπὸ τῆς προκειμ[έ-
νης] ἐξηγήσεως. παρατηρεῖν δε[
]ς πέπλασται ὁ λόγος αυ 20

[8] March (1987: 93).

] γὰρ ἐν Μυκάναισι δ' αυ
]τασευε κωκυτὸν ηκο
]πειν· οἱ δέ γε κωκύοντες
έ]πρασσον ὅτι οὐχὶ ἀναιρε-
. . .]υλη ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ τιμῆι του
δαιμ[ ]υτουτοδε αὐτὸ ἠθικῶς
ἀπηχ[ ]εν τῆ[ι] ἀναφωνήσει χρη
σα[ ]. α[]το τίς ἄμφατις ἔσται
]K. .[.] .[ ]. ε . οι βαρειαλαι
]. α .[ ] vestigia[30
επει. [. . .
σθα . [
]ονι .[

According to March, the fragment speaks of a lyric version of a story on a human sacrifice (l. 10), that of children (ll. 14-5) and, in fact, that of a girl (cf. l. 10). Consolation is mentioned (l. 4), but the mother in inconsolable (ll. 13-4), there is a lot of mourning occurring and, as noted, the sacrifice is conducted in order to honour a divine being (ll. 25-6). Finally, there is a reference to Μυκάναισι (l. 21), which allows the connection between the lyric poem discussed in the fragment and Iphigeneia's story. The name of Simonides is plausibly restored (l. 2), although he is probably used to draw a parallel between his version of the story and the one discussed here.[9]

[9] March (1987: 95) suggests the following reconstruction for lines 2-3: τοῦτωι ὁ Σιμω[νίδης ἂν συμφω- / νοῖτο περὶ τού[τ]ου.

In March's view, this fragment proves that Simonides was the first to omit the immortality of the girl and to allow the reaction of the mother, her grief and anger.[10] This is a possible but not inevitable reading of the evidence, because the first surfacing of a myth in a literary text is not necessarily its first appearance within the tradition. From the little that can be made out regarding the reaction of Klytaimnestra, the fragment attests to her laments, but not to any kind of reproach or accusation directed towards the father. The mother here holds a traditionally female role, that of the mourner.[11] Nevertheless, this lyric fragment is important in our search for current reactions, preceding or immediately following the sacrifice, as it has implications for the chronology when the maternal reaction enters the story.[12]

In the *Oresteia*, the last trilogy of Aischylos to be presented in 458 B.C. in Athens, the story of the girl's sacrifice is presented as a past event. It is found in the *parodos* of the *Agamemnon*, with additional references being made throughout the play. Iphigeneia is not saved in the *Oresteia*, and her death is used by the poet as part of her mother's motivation to kill her husband. Klytaimnestra is retrospectively harsh with her husband and very critical of his choices (ll. 1414-20) and she is clear concerning the reason of her revenge in two passages.

A. 1525-9:

> ἀλλ' ἐμὸν ἐκ τοῦδ' ἔρνος ἀερθὲν
> τὴν πολυκλαύτην

[10] March (1987: 97).

[11] For the mourning role of women, see p. 190, n. 9.

[12] There is also a reference to a different version of the story; perhaps this refers to the salvation version (ll. 16-7).

Ἰφιγένειαν ἀνάξια δράσας
ἄξια πάσχων μηδὲν ἐν Ἅιδου
μεγαλαυχείτω, ξιφοδηλήτῳ
θανάτῳ τείσας ἅπερ ἦρξεν.

A. 1551-9:

οὐ σὲ προσήκει τὸ μέλημ' ἀλέγειν
τοῦτο· πρὸς ἡμῶν
κάππεσε κάτθανε, καὶ καταθάψομεν,
οὐχ ὑπὸ κλαυθμῶν τῶν ἐξ οἴκων,
ἀλλ' Ἰφιγένειά νιν ἀσπασίως
θυγάτηρ, ὡς χρή,
πατέρ' ἀντιάσασα πρὸς ὠκύπορον
πόρθμευμ' ἀχέων
περὶ χεῖρα βαλοῦσα φιλήσει.

Before we turn to the lost play of Aischylos on the sacrifice of the girl, of which only one single line survives, we should discuss the *Iphigeneia* of Sophokles, of which there are more fragments surviving, and Euripides' *IA*. Few things can be retrieved from the version of Sophokles and its date is unknown. All that survives from the play are fragments *TrGF* iv 305-12 and it has been suggested that the argument of this play can be reconstructed on the basis of Hyginus 98 and Apollodoros *Epit.* 3. 21,[13] who are close to the *Kypria* tradition with minor differences.[14] It is, therefore, suggested that the story took place at Argos, and not at Aulis, where Odysseus, perhaps accompanied by Diomedes or Talthybios, had gone to bring the girl to the camp under the pretext of

[13] Séchan (1926: 372); Radt (1977: 270). For a cautionary note on the identification of tragic plots in Apollodoros and Hyginus, see respectively Huys (1996: 308-27 and 1997: 168-78).

[14] Note that Apollodoros makes Iphigeneia a prize to secure Achilleus' alliance and has Odysseus and Talthybios as the emissaries to Klytaimnestra, and in Hyginus Diomedes takes the place of Talthybios.

marriage. *TrGF* iv fr. 305 is attested as part of a speech of Odysseus to Klytaimnestra concerning Achilleus; he tells her that she will be one of the happiest mothers in law. *TrGF* iv frs. 306-307 are not very helpful; the latter is a general remark on the *phronema* of a man. *TrGF* iv fr. 308 could point to the fleet being confined at Aulis with nothing to do. *TrGF* iv fragments 309-12 are of lexicographical interest. There are no indications that the mother followed the daughter to Aulis, and no indication of what the result of the attempted sacrifice would be in the play of Sophokles.[15]

In *TrGF* iv fr. 305 Odysseus is lying to Klytaimnestra. It is unclear from the surviving evidence where the action takes place, but the fact that there are women in the play certainly allows the insertion of the female perspective. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the women would be given the opportunity to react and try to stop the sacrifice. If the play is set at Argos, it is difficult to see how the women could intervene to stop the sacrifice. We can only assume that the audience would witness the laments of these women for the sacrifice, if the death version was followed, which is, however, far from certain.

In *IA*, a posthumously produced play of Euripides, put on stage by his son in 405 B.C., the mother comes at Aulis accompanying her daughter and offers another viewpoint of what is about to happen. Hers is a more sentimental approach, in accordance with family values and maternal feelings. The story of the play is well known and will only

[15] Cropp (2000: 45) sees Sophokles in the *Iphigeneia* following the death version; Sutton (1984: 65) notes that there is no evidence on what the outcome of the sacrifice would be in Sophokles.

be mentioned briefly here. Agamemnon invited the women under the usual pretext of the marriage to Achilleus, but then changed his mind and sent a second letter cancelling the first. Menelaos stopped the second messenger and attacked his brother for acting so. Meanwhile, the women arrived with the infant Orestes, and an old servant of Agamemnon revealed the truth to Klytaimnestra and Achilleus. Klytaimnestra then asked for the latter's help and Achilleus assured her that he would intervene, should she not manage to persuade her husband. Klytaimnestra tried to convince Agamemnon and so did Iphigeneia with Orestes in her hands, albeit ineffectively. Iphigeneia finally decided to offer herself for sacrifice for the sake of the common cause. Then a messenger came to announce that the girl was saved by Artemis and replaced at the altar by a deer.

This is the only securely attested case that we have for a reaction of Klytaimnestra at the actual time of the sacrifice pointing to a collision between the two parents, even though it is the salvation version that is followed.[16] Klytaimnestra is presented as a strong woman, however inadequate to save her daughter, and she defends her child basing her speech on family values. Her female defense is put on in ll. 1146-1208.[17] Lines 1171-83 are prophetic of the criminal act of Klytaimnestra that is to follow and foretell what, to her, would be its justification:

[16] The *IA* does not necessarily have implications for the connection of the death version with the maternal opposition to the sacrifice, because of its late dating. The death of the girl was already allowed as a possibility, and Euripides could have used the opposition of Klytaimnestra to create the expectation that he would follow the death and not the salvation version. See pp. 302-3.

[17] See Synodinou (1985: 64) for the view that Klytaimnestra, who comes to Aulis with the conventional virtues of a wife, turns into a person in revolt; Alsina (1959: 318).

ἄγ', εἰ στρατεύσῃ καταλιπών μ' ἐν δώμασιν,
κἀκεῖ γενήσῃ διὰ μακρᾶς ἀπουσίας,
τίν' ἐν δόμοις με καρδίαν ἕξειν δοκεῖς;
ὅταν θρόνους τῆσδ' εἰσίδω πάντας κενούς,
κενοὺς δὲ παρθενῶνας, ἐπὶ δὲ δακρύοις
μόνη κάθωμαι, τήνδε θρηνῳδοῦσ' ἀεί·
Ἀπώλεσεν σ', ὦ τέκνον, ὁ φυτεύσας πατήρ,
αὐτὸς κτανών, οὐκ ἄλλος οὐδ' ἄλλῃ χερί,
†τοιόνδε μισθὸν καταλιπὼν πρὸς τοὺς δόμους†.
ἐπεὶ βραχείας προφάσεως ἐνδεῖ μόνον,
ἐφ' ᾗ σ' ἐγὼ καὶ παῖδες αἱ λελειμμέναι
δεξόμεθα δέξιν ἥν σε δέξασθαι χρεών.
μὴ δῆτα πρὸς θεῶν μήτ' ἀναγκάσῃς ἐμὲ
κακὴν γενέσθαι περὶ σὲ μήτ' αὐτὸς γένῃ.

The women of Chalkis, who in general have a moderate reaction in the play, add their voice to hers against the male perspective of Agamemnon in lines 1209-10, in their attempt to persuade the king that he would not be reproached if he was to save his child: πιθοῦ· τὸ γάρ τοι τέκνα συσσῴζειν καλόν, / Ἀγάμεμνον· οὐδεὶς πρὸς τάδ' ἀντερεῖ βροτῶν. Moreover, in lines 917-8 it is clear that the female chorus sides with Klytaimnestra and with the female-maternal perspective of things: δεινὸν τὸ τίκτειν καὶ φέρει φίλτρον μέγα, / πᾶσίν τε κοινόν ἐσθ' ὑπερκάμνειν τέκνων.

As Luschnig notes, the arrival of Klytaimnestra, Iphigeneia and Orestes in the *IA* transforms the camp into home.[18] We are, thus, allowed to see the collision of two distinct perspectives on the imminent sacrifice by two different worlds, the military and the familial, as well as the reasons for or against the occurrence of the sacrifice.

We return to the *Iphigeneia* of Aischylos.[19] As noted above, there is only one line surviving from the play of Aischylos and this is *TrGF* iii fr. 94, which, however short, is worth discussing as part of our search for current female reactions to the sacrifice. The fragment presents somebody suggesting that men should not be reviled by women, as this is improper. The line is preserved because of the untraditional use of the same verb (κυδάζομαι + subject in dative), in a line of Sophokles' *Aias* (l. 722: κυδάζεται τοῖς πᾶσιν Ἀργείοις ὁμοῦ) where Teukros is reviled by all the Argives for having a mad man as his brother, after Aias has attacked the booty.[20] The scholion (schol. S. *Aj.* 722) explains what the line means: λοιδορεῖ καὶ ὑβρίζεται ὑπὸ πάντων [...] καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐν Ἰφιγενείᾳ· 'οὔτοι γυναιξὶ <-> κυδάζεσθαι. τί γάρ;'[21]

[18] Luschnig (1988: 112).

[19] It is unfortunate that we do not know the order of the production of the Iphigeneia plays of Aischylos and Sophokles, since this makes it difficult to determine the direction of influence, if any.

[20] Kamerbeek (1953: 153) sees the word as appropriate for reviling a person in the tumult of a meeting.

[21] The suggested supplements (cf. Radt 1985: 214) are usually χρὴ (Blomfield) or δεῖ (Elmsey). The translation by Lloyd-Jones (1963: 411) reads: "Surely it befits not to be reviled by women. How should it?"

With the extreme paucity of the evidence we should, of course, allow all possibilities, but what would the women most probably accuse the men of in a play on the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, if not of the latter? The line positively points to some form of a gender collision. Women could always revile men for some other reason, perhaps completely irrelevant to the sacrifice, but would not this be made relevant to what happens in the play as a parallel? The line is probably a general remark related to a specific situation. The women mentioned could be responding to the imminent or just committed sacrifice of the girl. But who would these women be? It could be the girl and the mother. It could alternatively be a chorus of female attendants.[22]

The speaker could be a male referring to women, as the statement, admittedly lacunose, involves some form of surprise and reproach concerning the women's behaviour. It could indicate an actual or possible, perhaps feared or even discouraged, reaction of women. This would be building on established Greek power relationships between the sexes and male attitudes to women. This can only be related to women who have a voice in the play. Alternatively, there are two possibilities if the line is spoken by women. The first is that this is spoken by a feeble female character objecting to the actions of a stronger female in the manner of Ismene or Chysothemis in Sophokles or by a female chorus with surprise at the actions of a woman. Whoever the speaker is the

[22] A female chorus of prisoners is reproaching Menelaos in Aischylos' *Threissai* (cf. schol. S. *Aj.* 134a). There, however, the scholiast considers the behaviour of the chorus improper because they are prisoners. See pp. 83-4.

line points to female reaction at the time of the sacrifice and to some form of disapproval.

Does the play take place at Aulis? It would be better dramatically to include the sacrifice in the play rather than locate it in the past (as, for instance, a location at the palace would necessitate); confrontations would be allowed between the two perspectives on the sacrifice, that could perhaps explain the fragment, and Aulis is used as the place of action in Euripides' *IA*, which need not have been the first such occasion. Pending evidence, we should not insist on this any longer.

The play is often omitted in discussions of the influence of Aischylos on the *Iphigeneia* plays written by later poets. The plays are usually compared to what little can be made out in relation to the sacrifice of the girl in the *Oresteia*. However, although we have almost nothing from the *Iphigeneia*, one should at least acknowledge the fact that Sophokles, Euripides and others could, in fact, be more influenced by the homonymous play of Aischylos than by the references to the story found in his *Oresteia*, since for them there was still access to the *Iphigeneia*.

To conclude, the first occasions of current reactions to the sacrifice of Iphigeneia are to be found in the years of Simonides and Aischylos. The versions of the two poets, however, differ as far as the form of the female reaction is concerned. In Simonides the reaction seems to have been the traditionally female one of lamentation, whereas in the

Iphigeneia of Aischylos there is some form of a gender collision attested and this plausibly relates to the sacrifice. (Moreover, the fact that Pindar briefly refers to the death of the girl in 474 B.C. implies that the version was already circulating and Simonides and Aischylos were free to use it, perhaps in combination with the suggested reactions).

Finally, it is difficult to say whose version appeared first between that of Simonides and that of Aischylos, since the poets were close contemporaries. Nonetheless, it was during their lifetime, and before the years of the *Oresteia*, that feelings were expressed by women concerning the death of the girl in current time, and, at least in one case, these feelings might have caused the reproach of what appears, all through tradition, to have been a male decision. Perhaps tragic space was the place where one should anticipate an untraditional reaction of women concerning the sacrifice of Iphigeneia. Aischylos' *Iphigeneia* could be the first occurrence of opposition to the sacrifice in tradition, and in tragedy, before the *IA* of Euripides, which would then have at least one precedent.

Tragedy, unlike archaic poetry, often assigned to mythical women an important active role that was not previously attested for them and determined the evolution of their stories thereafter. Women in archaic myth were restricted to certain roles such as being the objects of exchange or the prizes in battles, they were mainly referred to in relation

to their performance in household activities, had a role in cult and in lamentation but they were generally limited in the house.[23]

In tragedy many of these traditional feminine roles are preserved for several of the female characters, but additionally, Greek drama created a whole new corpus of untraditional female heroines thinking and acting in a challenging way.[24] Occasionally the strong nonconformist female is presented alongside a feeble conventional female to accentuate the difference in their behaviour[25] (e.g. Antigone-Ismene, Elektra-Chrysothemis, Klytaimnestra-Kassandra). In such cases, it is always the unconventional female who determines the drama with her actions. These newly-emerged heroines are often presented with male characteristics, thus signaling how unorthodox their behaviour is for their kind.[26]

In tragedy women are, what is more, often put in a conflict against men on an *oikos* as opposed to *polis* basis.[27] This is, in a way, a collision of two worlds; the male of duty that resides in the *polis* sphere and the female of feelings and family that resides in the

[23] For more, see Easterling (1987: 15-6).

[24] Foley (1996: 49-50). For the difference between Athenian women and strong women in tragedy, see the discussion in Seidensticker (1995: 156-7); Hall (1997: 106).

[25] See Foley (1981: 142), for a distinction between conventional and unconventional women in tragedy.

[26] For the assignment of masculine characteristics to Klytaimnestra, see Foley (1981: 139; 151); MacClure (1999: 92; 73-80). For male characteristics of Medeia, see Gellie (1988: 16-7); Barlow (1989: 161); Galis (1992: 75-6).

[27] Goldhill (1986: 114); Zeitlin (1990: 76); Easterling (1987: 22); Foley (1981: 161). Foley notes, however, that this should not be seen as a simple equation, *oikos* (female)-*polis* (male), but a more complex model.

oikos sphere. In Greek tragedy women often become active and powerful and exit their *oikos* when called to defend family values and bonds; Antigone to bury her brother, Elektra to avenge her father's death, Medeia to punish her treacherous husband, Klytaimnestra to avenge her daughter's death, Hekabe to avenge her son's death. In such cases, women leave the realm of house to enter the male world but this always results in some form of punishment for them.[28] The opposition between *polis* and *oikos* would also be applicable in the case of Iphigeneia's sacrifice, as well. The general Agamemnon, seen through the prism of fifth-century Athens,[29] would have to serve the *polis*. Klytaimnestra, on the other hand, according to the expected female orientation, would have to serve her *oikos*, its values and the well-being of her family.

Motherhood, in specific, is one of the determining forces in women's behaviour in tragedy and, often, the motivating power behind their actions. Motherhood is time and again related to the women of tragedy that turn into criminals and to some extent renders their unconventional behaviour acceptable. Thus, it often gives women the license to exceed the limitations applying to their sex. There are occasions where a mother commits murder to revenge the death of her child, as, for example, Klytaimnestra and Hekabe do.[30] Alternatively, a mother can use her motherhood to avenge her husband, as in the case of Medeia. There are cases where a mother has

[28] Seidensticker (1995: 159).

[29] Contemporary characteristics of an Athenian general/politician are given to Achilleus in the *Myrmidones* and Palamedes in the *Palamedes*. See, respectively, pp. 117-20; 251-9.

[30] Loreaux (1998: 41; 54-6) suggests that grief over the loss of a child sometimes becomes wrath and action.

failed in her motherhood: Agave kills her own son unknowingly and Iokaste becomes her son's wife. In extreme cases the mother kills herself after her motherhood has ended or failed (Eurydike[31] and Iokaste).

In addition, mothers of dead children are repeatedly put on stage to lament the death, or imminent death, of their offspring (the Persian queen, Niobe, Europe, Eos, Thetis)[32] and this suggests that the Athenian audience was moved by the image, and, apparently, by the emotional bond between mother and child. They would, probably, sympathise with the tragedy of a mother led not only to extreme lamentation, but sometimes to murder or suicide because of the death of her child.

Notably, several of the women mentioned above first acquire a voice, even when they do not speak a word as in the case of Eurydike, when their motherhood is threatened one way or another. It is not improbable that under the circumstances of the imminent / commited sacrifice of her daughter in Aischylos' *Iphigeneia*, Klytaimnestra and / or the women around her first raise their voice. This would be a voice of reproach. This reaction would be prior to the retrospective reaction that we find in the *Oresteia*, a treatment that, however ground-breaking, need not have come all of a sudden (this is discussed below), and prior to the synchronised reaction attested in the *IA*.

---

[31] According to Easterling (1987: 22), Eurydike, who is presented as an ideal wife of the conventional type, behaves in the way the unconventional women of tragedy would, when she commits suicide and curses Kreon, her husband, as she dies.

[32] See p. 190.

The figure of Klytaimnestra is worth closer examination at this point. Klytaimnestra, a figure that had been reshaped by Aischylos for the needs of his *Oresteia*, was previously a woman that only had a secondary role in the killing of her husband, and was driven to this act by her passion for her lover.[33] In tradition she was the weak accomplice of Aigisthos, and the treacherous wife of Agamemnon, but in Aischylos she became the strong and determined principal avenger of her daughter's death, with Aigisthos now featuring only as a weak, and feminised,[34] accomplice by her side. Notably, Klytaimnestra becomes the colossal figure of the *Oresteia* exactly because her motherhood enters the story and drives her horrible actions.

To conclude, there appears to be no female reaction to or reproach of the sacrifice of Iphigeneia in early tradition in contrast to the case in later tragedy. Simonides is the first attested case of female lamentation concerning the sacrifice and Aischylos' *Iphigeneia* might have been a bridge between the earlier treatments and the later versions. A possible reaction of females in the *Iphigeneia*, perhaps of Klytaimnestra herself, is allowed by the surviving line and can be better understood as the result of the strong role that women were not infrequently allowed in Greek drama, of the prominent place that motherhood holds in tragedy and the license that it occasionally gives to mothers to react in a powerfully emotive way. The *Iphigeneia* could have opened the

[33] Denniston (1939: 9 intro.) suggests that her role is subordinate to that of Aigisthos until Aischylos' *Oresteia*; March (1987: 84-5). See also pp. 36-7.

[34] See A. *A.* 1625-7, where the members of the chorus address him as γύναι. For indications that the old men of the chorus are also presented feminised to some extent, thus leaving Klytaimnestra as the only one with strong male characteristics, see MacClure (1999: 98-9).

way for the re-creation of Klytaimnestra, the powerful woman who opposes Agamemnon, justifying her reaction through a very female aspect of hers, totally acceptable by tragic conventions, her motherhood. Her reason for reacting in the *Iphigeneia* would only be her love for her daughter, not her lust for Aigisthos or power. (In such a case, her motives would have been less questionable than in later tragedy.)

The outcome of the sacrifice

It is not clear which of the two versions (death or salvation) came first into existence. It has often been assumed that the death version has been replaced by the milder version when civilization developed and took a step forward from the primitiveness of the older culture.[35] Others have considered this explanation as simplistic and have regarded instead a myth that was originally created with two interwoven characteristics: the attempted sacrifice and the salvation of the girl, with the latter at some point omitted.[36]

It has been suggested that it was Aischylos who first excluded the salvation element and allowed the death version in his *Oresteia*.[37] This is the first extant text omitting the salvation of Iphigeneia. Nevertheless, the reference in Pindar *P.* 11.22-6 and the testimony related to Simonides (P. Oxy. 2434 / *PMG* 608 fr. 1 (a) +2) also allow the death of the girl. It is not impossible that this was the case in Homer, as well, where the

[35] Solmsen (1981: 357); Lloyd-Jones (1983: 101).

[36] Hughes (1989: 172-3).

[37] Henrichs (1980: 199; 204).

result of the sacrifice remains unclear.[38] It is not improbable that the hostility of Agamemnon to Kalchas in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 1.106) presupposes the sacrifice of his daughter.[39] This suggests that Aischylos, perhaps as early as the *Iphigeneia*, had a choice as to which version to follow.[40]

No matter what ending Aischylos gave to the sacrifice in the *Iphigeneia*, the female horror that we suspect in relation to the sacrifice could find its use before the outcome was known. The play would, in any case, be a building block in the evolution of the story of the Atreidae and the way towards the *Oresteia* of 458 B.C. The collisions and the characters that would have been formed in the *Iphigeneia* could to some extent have inspired the treatment of the myth in the *Oresteia*.

---

[38] Griffin (1977: 39-53) draws attention to the readiness of the cycle to admit miraculous features, such as the salvation, which Homer avoids. See p. 64, n. 34.

[39] See the discussion in Kirk (1985: 61; 64-5).

[40] Note that Aischylos need not, although he could, have used the same version of a myth in two different plays. For example, there are indications that he worked on the Aktaion myth on two different occasions, in the *Toxotides* and in the *Semele/Hydrophoroi*, and used two different versions of the myth. In the former, the hero is killed by Artemis after insulting her one way or another, in accordance with the most popular version of the story. In the latter, he is killed by Zeus, for being his antagonist for Semele. See Hadjicosti (2006b: 121-8), for the view that in the *Semele/Hydrophoroi* the death of Aktaion by Zeus has a special function; it is used to motivate Hera to enact her revenge against the girl.

Aischylos' Trojan war

Aischylos' treatment of the story of Troy incorporated many innovations. It is time to sum up the kinds of innovation which he inserted, their possible functions and their impact on subsequent literature. There are different reasons and varying objectives for Aischylos' changes. Several of these discussed here are probably inserted with the function of intensifying the emotional response of the audience and building up tension or creating opportunity for conflict. Such changes add to the disaster and the emotional intensity of the situation. For example, in the fragmentary *Philoktetes*, Odysseus, the enemy of the hero, is probably for the first time sent as the emissary to persuade him to rejoin the army, and this choice leads to the collision between the two men (cf. pp. 221-2). In the *Threissai*, Aias cannot easily commit suicide, because he does not know which the single vulnerable part of his body is (cf. p. 67). This new element of the story involves the audience emotionally in a prolonged narrated scene, where they hear of the hero's strenuous efforts to die. In the *Palamedes*, Odysseus' traditional revenge motive is turned into *pthtonos* for a man better than him.

Apollon gives false hopes for a supposed longevity of Achilleus to Thetis in *TrGF* iii fr. 350, failing the goddess in their friendship and he is criticised for it in a fervent speech by her. Achilleus and Patroklos are lovers in the *Myrmidones*, no longer best friends, and this has the effect of maximising the pain of the former for the loss of the latter in what appears to have been a very passionate and erotic lamentation scene. Relationships (friendly, erotic but mostly parental) are generally given a lot of emphasis in fragmentary Aischylos, especially when a death has occurred or is imminent. The

psychostasia for Memnon and Achilleus with the intervention of both their mothers is given more space in Aischylos than the relevant *kerostasia* motif ever had in Homer. Nauplios is present to inquire, and possibly lament, the death of his son in the *Palamedes*. Europe is on stage in the *Kares/Europe* to receive her dead son after the battle. Thetis is on stage in *TrGF* iii fr. 350 to lament for her son. In the *Telephos* the father-son relationship between Agamemnon and Orestes is probably used to evoke pity in the context of a supplication.

As the result of these changes, the stories are not only given a new twist, opening new potentials, but the emotions of the characters (anger, love, loss etc.) are magnified, and this allows the intense emotional engagement of the audience as well. The overstated feelings of a mourning mother, a bereaved lover, a betrayed friend are all understandable to the audience of Aischylos, and they are also understandable to audiences diachronically and universally. There are other changes, however, that Aischylos brings to the stories which are more closely and more specifically related to the life in fifth-century Athens.

Adjusting the myth to fifth-century reality

The epic stories found a new environment to flourish on the stage of fifth-century Athens. The new surroundings had their own effect on the way in which the stories were told by the poets and on the way in which they were perceived by the audience. Tragedy and democracy were seen to be closely connected: although tragedy was born in the years of the tyranny, it reached its mature form in the world of the democratic

polis, a world in which political and social structures are very different from those of the epic world.[1] According to Meier, there was no institution other than tragedy that could set this new political and social situation in a general perspective and open it to discussion.[2]

The new democratic society forming was not only distant from the epic world but perhaps to some extent from its stories (the characters, their motives, their actions). This gap between Athens and myth was filled by Aischylos, who found creative ways of incorporating contemporary elements in the mythical stories. Although these innovations of Aischylos occasionally extend beyond the scope of politics, beyond the sphere of democracy, politics is among his most common references. On several occasions the surviving plays have been seen to refer to fifth-century politics. In the *Hiketides*, for example, the dependence of the king on popular support is clear and the relevant passage (ll. 605-14) reflects the structure and content of Athenian decrees to a degree remarkable, especially for its date, soon after the explosion of inscriptions in the 460s.[3] It is with the same speed that Aischylos incorporates the changes to the role of the *Areopagos* in the *Oresteia* (cf. p. 39). In the *Agamemnon* (ll. 810-7), moreover, there is reference to the voting practice in Athenian courts of the time, used not in a formal trial context but to describe revenge.[4] References in the *Agamemnon* to the

[1] Vernant and Vidal-Naquet (1986: 152; 154); Easterling (1993a: 561); Goldhill (1986: 77-8); Wilson (2000: 70-1; 76-7).

[2] Meier (1988: 213). Rhodes (2003: 119).

[3] Carey (2007: 8-11); Easterling (1985: 2).

[4] Carey (2007: 23); Easterling (1985: 3).

demos are much more common than one would expect in a mythical monarchy (cf. *A.* 456-7; 640; 938; 1409; 1616).[5]

The case is similar with the fragmentary plays. A trial for treason is fabricated by Odysseus for Palamedes, who was murdered in a simpler way in the epic version (cf. pp. 251-8). Many treason trials were taking place in the fifth century, and the audience would be familiar with the procedure of the *eisangelia.* The clash between the collective and Achilleus in the *Myrmidones* is new to the epic context, but it is in accordance with the contemporary punishment of generals at Athens who did not serve their country well. The mythical return of Philoktetes in the homonymous play was perhaps seen on fifth-century stage under the light of civil strifes resulting in ostracisms or exiles.

There is, no doubt, an intensive interrelation between the city and the theatre evidenced by the importance of the theatrical contest in Athenian life.[6] But it is important not to be too restricictive. Rhodes suggested that Athenian drama was reflecting the *polis* and not the democratic *polis* in particular.[7] There are in truth allusions to contemporary elements of fifth-century Athenian reality which go beyond the structures and practices of democratic politics. Writing and the use of coinage are persistent anachronisms in tragedy,[8] for example, as is the presentation of Athens and Corinth as important cities

[5] See discussion in Dodds (1960: 20).

[6] Kuch (1993: 546-7); Goldhill (1986: 75-6).

[7] Rhodes (2003: 119).

[8] Easterling (1985: 4-6).

and there are examples of hero-cult - almost entirely absent from the world of epic - to be found in the surviving plays.[9] In fragmentary Aischylos, for instance, there is the case of Aias, a hero who was partly dishonoured in epic tradition with an improper burial, but who was also an eminent hero with his own cult in Athens of the time. The poet may in part have rewritten the story of Aias by adding an act of divine *charis* as a more favourable treatment.

The mythical Trojan enemies, who are turned by tragedy into fifth-century barbarians, are also one of the most common examples of mixing myth and reality. There are several qualities of real-life barbarians that are assigned to the Trojans and their allies in the fragmentary plays of Aischylos, some of which can be related to politics but others cannot. For example, the famous Carian mourners, working professionally in Athens of the time, are chosen over the Lycians to form the lamenting chorus of the fragmentary *Kares/Europe* play. Their music and lamentation would be familiar to the audience from real-life funerals. Furthermore, the supplication that we suspect for Telephos in the homonymous play is noted by ancient *testimonia* as a practice of a specific group of people, living in the margins of the Greek world and considered by some to be barbarian. Aischylos uses his audience's interest in these people and their culture.

Another remarkable aspect of the fragmentary plays is the insertion of Athenian social practices into the stories. A notable example is the homosexuality of Achilleus and

[9] Easterling (1985: 10, n. 39).

Patroklos, which is not demanded by the plot. This innovation might, in fact, have been in accordance with how the relationship of the two heroes was perceived in fifth-century Athens by an audience familiar with homosexuality (cf. pp. 133-4).

Having taken the bold step of revisiting an old story by Homer, Aischylos had no choice but to use his imagnation to create a fresh story that could live up to the comparison with the long-established and admired *Iliad* and with a number of successful and influential epic or lyric versions. The changes which he made to the stories transformed the epic tales to more accessible accounts for contemporary audiences and, would normally, create a renewal of interest. The result was closer audience engagement with the story, both intellectually (through trial procedures etc.) and emotionally.[10] The emotional response of the audience, which is so important in the theatre, is something that can be guided in many ways by a dramatist.[11] The collective experience, as expressed through the chorus,[12] would help in this direction, as would the public sharing of grief and other feelings.[13]

Aischylos' most important accomplishment in writing his own version of a myth (not only the Trojan myth) is that he could make it to a considerable extent feel contemporary. He could use the epic tales to touch problems, collisions and feelings of

[10] Lada (1996: 409) suggests that "tragic performance in ancient Greece implied a model of audience-response wherein affect and intellect, 'emotion' and 'meaning', were inextricably interwoven."

[11] Easterling (1996: 177-8).

[12] Gould (1996: 219); Goldhill (1996: 255).

[13] Segal (1996: 149-50) believes that lamentation scenes in particular created this collective feeling among members of the audience.

the Athenians giving them the opportunity to examine them and themselves at the necessary distance that can sometimes clarify things or pose critical questions. What is remarkable is that these fifth-century real-life elements, however evident they sometimes are, do not reduce in the slightest the sense of universal potential that the plays carry.[14] The Aischylean stories can today pose similar critical questions to societies that could not have been more different from fifth-century Athens or from each other.

[14] As suggested by Taplin (1999: 56)

Reception

This section is an overview of the impact that the story of Troy as told by Aischylos had on subsequent literature, starting with the reception by other Athenian playwrights. Aischylos' Trojan corpus was in many ways different from the epic stories on Troy as it involved several innovations of the poet. Some of these innovations were distant from the mythical world of epos but closely related to the fifth-century city and the Athenian audience. In certain cases Aischylos even gave the stories a completely new outline and this was occasionally established over the epic one, as the study of his reception often suggests. It was he, for example, who created an on-stage Athenian-like trial for Palamedes to replace the epic ambush (the latter is rarely repeated after Aischylos). Later playwrights on occasion follow the storyline of Aischylos and not the epic one, without this implying a passive reception on their part.

The reception of Aischylean stories by Sophokles, Euripides and all other Athenian tragedians can only be examined under the revealing light of inter-generic authorial competition. The tragedians presented their plays in contests and competed for the prize that was given to the winner on the judgment of the Athenian audience. The tragedians were evidently conscious of the competition, not only of the synchronic competition with their colleagues competing on the same occasion with different myths but also of a diachronic competition with all tragedians that had written on the same myth before them. Since all playwrights worked more or less on the same stories, the contest was rather a matter of originality.

Sophocles

Sophokles is in general the more conservative in his response to the innovations of Aischylos, and this is partly understandable since they both presented their plays in the same years.[15] He came across many innovations in Aischylean poetry, but he did not adopt every one of them. However, occasionally he does follow the main lines of the new version of a story as this is found in Aischylos. In cases like the *Palamedes* and the *Philoktetes*, the younger poet seems to adopt the new version of events, as probably initiated by Aischylos. But whereas he accepts the new story in its main lines, he gives a new twist to the plot: Palamedes' inventions in the homonymous play of Sophokles are mentioned in the third person, and this can only mean that the hero did not defend himself as was the case in Aischylos.

Moreover, in the *Philoktetes* the collision between Odysseus and Philoktetes, created by Aischylos, is cleverly used by Sophokles to determine the plot, but is kept in the background, when the poet decides to replace Odysseus with Neoptolemos. Perhaps it is of some importance that the *Philoktetes* was presented so late in his career (409 B.C.), and almost fifty years after the death of Aischylos. It is not improbable that by that time he felt freer to refer to the work of his former antagonist.

Additionally, in the *Aias*, where the dramatic situation is that of the Aischylean *Threissai*, there are many elements that refer to the older play. Most interesting of all is the fact that the suicide of the Sophoklean hero surprisingly and uniquely, as far as

[15] The younger poet was victorious against the older one in his first appearance in theatre due to the judgment of the ten generals (cf. Aischylos' *Vita* 27-8; Plu. *Cim.* 8.7).

Greek tragedy is concerned, takes place on stage. This is too important to be taken simply as a gratuitous detail, especially when the Aischylean play is known to have made such an issue of the suicide of the hero (cf. pp. 90-3). This could be the response of the younger poet to the strenuous efforts of the almost wholly invulnerable Aias of Aischylos to commit suicide. In the *Aias*, moreover, there is a restoration of Aias through the help of his former enemy, Odysseus, who is responsible for the proper burial of the hero. In the *Theissai* there are indications that a restoration of some form was taking place in the Aischylean version, as well, but was this time related to a divine agent. In his lost play entitled *Phryges*, the plot of which is considered to be the same as the *Phryges/Hektoros Lytra* of Aischylos, Sophokles presented Achilleus as silent for a long period on stage, recreating thus the Aischylean silence in the same context, but probably with a different motive (cf. pp. 151-2).

Euripides

For Euripides one should have a different starting point: Aischylos had never been an antagonist for Euripides and his approach to a classic dead poet's work is radically different from that of Sophokles. Of course there would be members of the audience of Euripides that would have watched Aischylos competing or others that would have watched revivals of Aischylean plays.

Revivals outside Athens were taking place on a significant scale already in the fifth century.[16] The Demoi festivals presented revivals, perhaps alongside plays by local

[16] See Taplin (1999: 43).

playwrights.[17] It should, of course, be noted that revivals of Aischylos are a special case as it is attested that a special decree after his death in 456 B.C. allowed re-performances of his plays.[18] It is unclear, however, if this implied revivals at the Great Dionysia. Csapo and Slater speak of re-performances of plays at smaller festivals from the years of the early fifth century and of evidence for revivals of comedy at the major festivals by the end of the century.[19] It is from the fourth century, however, that we certainly find revivals of tragedies officially presented in Athens at the City Dionysia. The evidence attests the year of 386 B.C. as the date of the first performance of an old tragedy in the City Dionysia.[20] The decree of Lykourgos that officially endorsed and promoted revivals is dated later to 350-30 (Plu. *Dec. Or. Vit.* 841F).[21]

To return to Euripides, in cases where the Aischylean version differs from the epic, the younger poet frequently prefers to follow Aischylos. This could be a personal choice of the poet partly based on the fact that by the time of Euripides the new versions of Aischylos may have been at least partly established in the public consciousness. There is also a trademark of the poet when reworking an Aischylean story: he is keen on correcting certain cases of implausibility that he apparently considers important. These details that he corrects sometimes become intertextual pointers between the two plays, as in the *Elektra's* recognition scene.

---

[17] Taplin (1999: 37); Easterling (1993a: 564-5).

[18] See *TrGF* iii *testimonium* A1 48-9 / *Vita* 48-9; Ar. *Ach.* 9-12; schol. Ar. *Ach.* 10.

[19] Csapo and Slater (1995: 3).

[20] Pickard-Cambridge (1953: 73); Csapo and Slater (1995: 3).

[21] Easterling (1993a: 564) believes that by 456 B.C., when the decree concerning Aischylos appeared, there were already revivals at Athens, perhaps informal, private or incomplete.

Nevertheless, there are cases where the poet breaks loose from the Aischylean outline that he is following and gives a new twist to the story. The *Philoktetes* is in part one such case. Euripides has been faithful to the main story of Aischylos and to details, but he has added a new focal point to the action: a Trojan embassy arrives to request the alliance of Philoktetes to revoke the imminent fall of Troy (cf. pp. 235-6). The play, consequently, takes on a completely different course, meaning and interest. A further example can be found in the *Telephos*. Euripides, again while keeping in line with the Aischylean play, fundamentally reshapes the motif of the *megiston hiketeuma* that was probably found in Aischylos with the infant son of Agamemnon; in Euripides the motif is distorted to become sheer blackmail (cf. pp. 277-9). The main difference between the two plays concerns the *ethos* of the formerly noble characters who now reveal their criminal nature with the violence of their actions. Having no evidence of Iliadic plays by Euripides, one could suggest that there seems to have been a reluctance to face Homer head on as far as the successors of Aischylos are concerned.

Roman Tragedy

Before we discuss the influence of Aischylos on Latin dramas on Troy we should firstly make a brief reference to the way in which Latin drama in general was inspired by Greek drama, as this clarifies our approach to the issue of Aischylos' reception in Rome. From Livius Andronicus down to Accius, tragedy was vigorous in Rome but the death of the latter in 86 B.C. signals the end of the production of new tragedies written to be presented in Rome, with the exception of Varius' *Thyestes* and Ovidius'

Medea.[22] However, older tragedies were still performed.[23] Greek tragedy played an important role in the formation of Roman tragedy. Roman playwrights probably had access to the dramatic texts of the Greek playwrights with proper editions aimed at a scholarly public, or even with scripts of theatrical companies acting in Southern Italy.[24] The number of titles from the Roman repertoire that point to a Greek origin is extensive. In Rome some plays would naturally be more popular than others. Thus, for example, there is no play on Palamedes, whereas there are several tragedies on Achilleus and Aias.

The influence of Greek originals on Latin dramas was to take many forms, from word-by-word translation, as in the case of *Antiope*, according to Cicero's testimony (*De Fin. 1*.2) to close modelling.[25] There were two methods used by Roman poets who modelled their plays on Greek originals, emulation and contamination, respectively meaning the adaptation of the originals and the conflation of elements from more than one Greek play in a Latin one. The prologue of the *Andria* of Terentius is enlightening (ll. 9-21):

> *Menander fecit Andriam et Perinthiam.*
> *qui utramvis recte norit ambas noverit,*
> *non ita dissimili sunt argumento, et tamen*

[22] See Dumont and François-Garelli (1998: 124).

[23] Beare (1950: 126) notes that these revivals continued down to the end of the Republic and that Aesopus, the tragic actor and friend of Cicero, enjoyed a great reputation. Dumont and François-Garelli (1998: 125) also note that Cicero had seen a number of Pacuvius' tragedies performed.

[24] Gentili (1979: 16). Gentili also suggests (*ibid.*: 21-2) that editions for schools were included in the repertoire of theatrical companies.

[25] Beare (1950: 127); Valsa (1957: 8); Jocelyn (1967: 23-7).

dissimili oratione factae ac stilo.
quae convenere in Andriam ex Perinthia
fatetur transtulisse atque usum pro suis.
id isti vituperant factum atque in eo disputant
contaminari non decere fabulas.
faciuntne intellegendo ut nil intellegant?
qui quom hunc accusant, Naevium, Plautum, Ennium
accusant, quos hic noster auctores habet,
quorum aemulari exoptat neglegentiam
potius quam istorum obscuram diligentiam.[26]

Such adaptations are done with relative freedom, and present varying degrees of originality, but nevertheless they clearly point to their influence by the Greek originals. As the term contamination implies, often more than one Greek tragedy is used to create a Roman tragedy. This pattern usually takes one of two forms. In the first form, two Greek tragedies on the same story but by different playwrights are used by a Roman poet, who combines elements from two or even more tragedies in his own play. Alternatively, a Roman poet combines two Greek tragedies with continuous plot, but not necessarily by the same Greek playwright, to create one condensed play. It is difficult to speak in terms of distinct categories of this influence when all different gradations are possible.

[26] The translation is by Barsby i (2001: 50-3): "Menander wrote a *Woman of Andros* and a *Woman of Perinthos*. If you know one, you know them both, since the plots are not very different, though they are written in a different language and style. Our author confesses that he has transferred anything suitable from the *Woman of Perinthos* to the *Woman of Andros* and made free use of it. His critics abuse him for doing this, arguing that it is not right to contaminate plays in this way. But isn't their cleverness making them obtuse? In criticising our author, they are actually criticizing Naevius, Plautus, and Ennius, whom he takes as his models, preferring to imitate their carelessness in this respect rather than the critics' own dreary pedantry."

From the above one might get the impression that Greek drama was used as a large container of elements that served for inspiration with no distinctions. It is occasionally suggested that Roman poet *A* follows Greek poet *B* in rewriting a certain play or even generally in his corpus. How safe can such an inference be when Greek tragedy seems to have been approached as a unified whole from which one could draw at one's own preference? We should rather be speaking, say, of Aischylean elements in Roman plays, and not of Aischylean plays being adapted.

As a result of the complicated way in which the Romans used the Greek plays and of the mostly fragmentary nature of their work, the research on Aischylean influences in Roman plays delivered less than promised. However, some results are extracted by checking the wording of the fragments, the presence of certain characters on stage, the reproduction of a certain situation, the possible presence of characteristic elements of a Greek play or for combinations from different Greek originals, even elements from previous Roman plays that are also occasionally contaminated.

It is generally difficult to see the connection between a Roman and Greek play, but occasionally one gets a good starting point: for example, the title *Armorum Iudicium* points to the Aischylean play *Hoplon Krisis*. However, on a closer look, one understands that the two Roman plays in question present both the events taking place in the *Hoplon Krisis* and events that take place in the *Threissai*, which presented the death of Aias, and, moreover, events presented in the *Aias* of Sophokles (cf. pp. 93-6). Therefore, a distinction should be made between the reception of Greek models in the

former and the latter parts of both *Armorum Iudicium* plays. The absence of a *Hoplon Krisis* by Sophokles or Euripides, or other poets as far as we know, implies that Aischylos is likely to have been the inspiration for the former part of both plays. On the other hand, as far as the second part is concerned, the presentation of the death and the burial of Aias, the Roman poets had more than one source. The *Philocteta* of Accius has some indication of influence from all three tragedians and is a good example of how complex the study of the reception of Greek tragedies in Rome can occasionally be (cf. pp. 240-1).

Reception of fragments

The reception and the influence that some of Aischylos' dramatic innovations, as found in the fragmentary plays, have does not stop with Sophokles, Euripides or the Latin poets. C.P. Cavafy, a Greek poet at the turn of the twentieth century was fascinated by the passion of a small fragment of Aischylos cited in Platon (*TrGF* iii fr. 350). Cavafy had already written two poems closely inspired by the corpus of Aischylos at the time. The two poems, which Cavafy chose not to publish, are *Naval Battle* (1899), which refers to the *Persai* (472 B.C.) and *When the Watchman Saw the Light* (1900), which is inspired by the prologue of the *Agamemnon* (458 B.C.). Lastly, there is *Unfaithfulness* (1903), the poem which Cavafy wrote inspired by the small fragment on Thetis' accusation against Apollon. *Unfaithfulness*, the only Aischylean poetry to make it through Cavafy's exhaustive perfectionism, was published in 1904 in *Panathenaia.*

Appendix

TrGF iii fr. **99 and the assignment to the *Kares/Europe*

The authenticity of the *Kares/Europe* has been recently questioned by M.L. West.[1] West considers the play to be the first part of a trilogy, followed by the *Memnon* and the *Psychostasia*, and believes that the first and the third play of this trilogy are not the authentic work of Aischylos.[2] The basis of West's challenge is metrical, linguistic and dramaturgical evidence from *TrGF* iii fr. **99 which will be discussed below.[3] This is the largest fragment to have been assigned to the play by scholars, albeit on circumstantial evidence. *TrGF* iii fr. **99 has been included in all recent major editions of the lost corpus of Aischylos under the title *Kares/Europe*.[4] The fragment is, in fact, so interwoven with the title in the modern scholarly tradition that, when its authenticity is questioned, then the authenticity of the Aischylean play also comes into question.

Although West is right in noting discrepancies between *TrGF* iii fr. **99 and the rest of the Aischylean corpus, this, in our opinion, is not sufficient for causing suspicions concerning the Aischylean authorship of the *Kares/Europe*. It should, however, be enough to evoke a re-examination of the tentative assignment of *TrGF* iii fr. **99 to the Aischylean *Kares/Europe* that has persisted since the

[1] West (2000: 347-50). It should be noted that West edits the fragment. His modifications, however, are not mentioned in the current study because they do not affect his argument.

[2] See pp. 180-2.

[3] For the text, see pp. 188-9.

[4] Weir-Smyth (1926: 415-6); Lloyd-Jones (1963: 602-3); Nauck (1926: 32-5); Radt (1985: 217-21) edits it with the sign ** to suggest the uncertainty of the assignment; Diggle (1998: 16-7).

1880s. In the interest of completeness, *TrGF* iii fr. **99 was discussed as part of the *Kares/Europe* of Aischylos in the main body of this study (cf. pp. 187-99). Here we address the issue of its authenticity.

The papyrus

The papyrus, now in the Louvre, belonged to the library of Firmin-Didot and was first edited by H. Weil in 1879.[5] In the first edition Weil edited the text as two separate parts (*a*: ll. 1-15 and *b*: ll. 16-23). He did not consider them as coming from the same text and, least of all, as being a continuous fragment. He identified Europe as the speaker of passage *a* and assigned it to the *Kares/Europe* tragedy of Aischylos, but thought that passage *b* was spoken by Achilleus and that Patroklos was the object of his anxiety, and, therefore, assigned it to the *Myrmidones* of Aischylos.[6] A year later, in 1880, Blass, Bergk, Wecklein and Buecheler, who each wrote articles on the newly edited papyrus, all connected the two pieces as part of the same text.[7] All scholars thereafter were to follow them in connecting the two parts of the text and assigning it to the *Kares/Europe* of Aischylos.[8] Weil, himself, agreed in an 1880 article.[9]

The papyrus belongs to the well-preserved corpus of papyri found at the Serapeion at Memphis and is written both on the recto (six columns) and on the verso (four

[5] Weil (1879).

[6] Weil (1879: 18; 23).

[7] Blass (1880: 86); Bergk (1880: 248); Wecklein (1880: 415); Buecheler (1880: 94).

[8] See Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1914: 57); Fraenkel (1943: 3); Mette (1963: 109-10); Ferrari (1982: 96); Radt (1985: 217); Diggle (1998: 16); West (2000: 347).

[9] Weil (1880: 148).

columns). It contains, on both sides, three columns of the same passage. In this passage, a young woman tries to convince her father that she must be allowed to stay with her husband. Weil supposed this to be from the lost Euripidean tragedy *Temenidai* and believed that it was spoken by Hyrnetho.[10] Today, however, the fragment is considered to be comic.[11] On the recto, in the fourth, fifth and sixth column, the papyrus contains four dramatic passages in iambic trimester, the first of which consists of eight lines from the prologue of Euripides' *Medeia.*[12] Passages two and three are combined to form *TrGF* iii fr. **99. The fourth passage is a still unidentified fragment of comedy.[13] These last four passages are not in the same hand as is the big Euripidean piece. *TrGF* iii fr. **99 and the other small dramatic passages on the recto of the papyrus were either written out from memory or dictation and, as Weil says, by someone who had a merely elementary knowledge of dictation; the passages are badly disfigured and contain many mistakes.[14] Wilcken, having worked extensively on this corpus, reached the conclusion that the passages in question were written by a boy of thirteen or fourteen, Apollonios, the brother of Ptolemaios and son of Glaukia, around 160

[10] Weil (1879: 12-3). According to Bell (1993: 253), Hyrnetho, who was a daughter of Temenos, one of the Herakleidai, married Deiphontes, son of another of the Herakleidai. Temenos loved Deiphontes so much that he wanted him to succeed him instead of his own sons. On realising this, his sons killed Temenos and tried to persuade their sister that she had married below herself, so that she would abandon Deiphontes who was a constant threat to their throne. She would not, and in their effort to abduct her, they killed her, while being pursued by Deiphontes.

[11] Harder (1985: 6) speaks of a well-attested subject in comedy where a father wants to take his daughter away from her husband and sees the passage on the Firmin-Didot papyrus to fall into this category. See also Gomme and Sandbach (1973: 723-9).

[12] Weil (1879:16).

[13] Weil (1879: 25). See Austin (1973: 313-4), for the controversy concerning its authorship.

[14] Weil (1879: 16-7).

B.C.[15] On the verso, following the repetition of the big Euripidean piece, in the fourth column, there are two epigrams of the Alexandrian era, by Poseidippos.[16] Finally, on the verso there is a catalogue of expenses that allows us to date the papyrus to 161 B.C. The recto was probably written some years earlier than that.[17]

Weil, when first editing the text, supposed it was by Aischylos or by an imitator of Aischylos.[18] In his 1880 article Weil, under the weight of all the articles which appeared in that year accepting the authorship of Aischylos, put aside his former doubts as to whether the fragment was actually Aischylean; the argument of the play, he suggests, is so simple that no tragedian following Aischylos would have written it.[19] Ever since, virtually all researchers have accepted the authorship of Aischylos for the fragment in question, with few exceptions, as, for example, that of Cobet in 1880, who considered the passage to be part of the prologue of Euripides' *Rhadamanthys*.[20] This seems improbable, however, because of the structure of the passage indicating that Sarpedon, and not Rhadamanthys or Minos, is the hero whose story will be narrated in this tragedy. The fragment presents a form of *priamel*: a move from brief references to Minos and Rhadamanthys to a longer reference to Sarpedon. *TrGF* iii fr. **99 is not the kind of fragment that can be accommodated as a side story in a play whose main

[15] Wilcken (1927: 115).

[16] Weil (1879: 30). See Turner and Parsons (1987: 82); Gow and Page (1965: 169-70).

[17] Weil (1879: 34).

[18] Weil (1879: 22).

[19] Weil (1880: 147).

[20] Cobet (1880: 64).

argument would be different. On the contrary, it seems to be the main story of a play by itself. The mother of the hero, being in a far-away land, is waiting for his return and the story needs an ending. The passage seems to have been part of a *nostos* play.[21]

The tragedy

The *Kares/Europe* was the only obvious choice for the assignment of the fragment, as there is no other surviving title that can be related to Sarpedon as easily. Sophokles' corpus includes only two titles from the saga, the *Minos* (*TrGF* iv fr. 407) and the *Kamikoi* (*TrGF* iv frs. 323-7) – according to Radt, being one and the same, revolving around the story of Daidalos.[22] Euripides has the title *Kressai* (*TrGF* v frs. 460-70a) and the *Kretes* (*TrGF* v frs. 471a-2g), but the former has to do with the story of Aerope[23] and the latter with that of Minos and Pasiphae.[24] In the titles surviving for the lesser known tragedians, none is found which might accommodate the said fragment.

Nevertheless, we should take into account the fact that there were probably close to one thousand tragic plays produced in Athens in the fifth century B.C.[25] The surviving titles, both tragic and satyric, assigned to fifth-century tragedians

[21] For a discussion on *nostos* plays, see p. 190, n. 8.

[22] Radt (1977: 348; 310).

[23] As attested in Ar. *Ra.* 849-50 and schol. S. *Aj.* 1297a. For the plot of the play, see Jouan and Van Looy ii (2000: 289); Kannicht (2004: 494-6).

[24] For the plot of the play, see schol. Ar. *Ra.* 849-50. See, furthermore, Cantarella (1964: 112-20); Austin (1968: 49-50); Collard, Cropp and Lee (1995: 54-55); Jouan and Van Looy ii (2000: 303); Cozzoli (2001: 53-6); Kannicht (2004: 504).

[25] See Blume (1978: 5); Ashby (1999: 2-3).

approximate to three hundred.[26] This allows a lot of space for speculation concerning the lost tragic corpus, in the fifth century and beyond, and one could plausibly suggest the feasibility of a second play on Sarpedon with his mother being a central character, not that different from what the Aischylean title *Kares/Europe* suggests.

The doubts

Let us start with the doubts raised by West. There are actually two conclusions reached by West in his article: firstly, he rejects the authorship of Aischylos for the *Kares/Europe* and, secondly, he assigns the play to Euphorion, the son of Aischylos, whom he also considers to be the poet of the *Prometheus*. At this point, our discussion focuses on the first conclusion reached by West. West's first point for rejecting Aischylean authorship involves metrical problems in *TrGF* iii fr. **99. West examines the metre of *TrGF* iii fr. **99 and notes the existence of two anapaests, one of which is a proper name (ll. 12; 21). He considers this to be a feature that points to the non-Aischylean origin of the passage.[27]

There are, in fact, more metrical irregularities in the passage, such as three cases of enjambment (ll. 5-6; 12; 17-8),[28] two cases of interlinear hiatus (ll. 18-19; 20-

[26] For the surviving titles of Aischylos, see *TrGF* iii *testimonia* A.1.50-1; A.2.6-7; Gn 78, for Sophokles, see *TrGF* iv *testimonia* A. 1.76-7; A.2.8-9, for Euripides, see *TrGF* v *testimonia* A.1.IA.28-9; A.1.IB.57-9; A.3.23-6; A.4.14-5; B 6-8, and for titles attested under the names of other fifth-century poets, see *TrGF* i 1-49.

[27] West (2000: 349). See, moreover, p. 330.

[28] According to Griffith (1977: 96); Garvie (1969: 37), in Aischylos rates of enjambment vary from 4.6% in the *Seven* to 8.5% in the *Hiketides*. *TrGF* iii fr. **99 has a rate of 13%.

1), the latter of which is a non-stop hiatus,[29] two *princeps* resolutions (ll. 1: 3rd *princeps*; 4: 4th *princeps*), all in a total of twenty three lines.[30]

It is important to bear in mind, however, certain things: firstly, that we possess only a small number of lines from the play and the scale inevitably indicates that we are dealing with a tiny sample. Secondly, the fact that these lines could be the prologue of the play and, as it is suggested by Cropp and Fick when examining the metre in Euripides' plays, the prologues have some special metrical characteristics: for example, they always have a higher percentage of resolutions than the plays as a whole.[31] As Cropp and Fick explain, this happens firstly because the prologue contains a number of personal, genealogical and geographical terms and, secondly, because the prosaic narrative style of the prologue seems to encourage the admission of relatively loose rhythms. If *TrGF* iii fr. **99 constitutes the prologue of a play, then it is just such a narrative prologue that includes several personal terms. However, this is only a possibility, but, as such, it should be taken into account. Thirdly, some, though not all, of the problems noted could perhaps reflect textual corruption.

---

[29] See, also, p. 330.

[30] For resolutions in the Aischylean corpus, see p. 330. A further criterion which we apply is the number of words used in each line: in Aischylos the average is 5.5 words per line, with the highest rate being that of the *Hiketides*, which is 5.6. Sophokles has an average rate of 5.9, with 6.1 in the *Philoktetes*. The numbers are found in Griffith (1977: 92-4), who considers the *Prometheus* with a rate of 5.4 to be Aischylean-like and incompatible with Sophokles. With the same perspective it seems that *TrGF* iii fr. **99, which has a rate of 5.86 per line, differs suspiciously from the numbers for Aischylos. Although taken alone this fact would not incline one to doubt authenticity, in combination with other non-Aischylean features it becomes significant.

[31] Cropp and Fick (1985: 17).

There are, moreover, several words in *TrGF* iii fr. **99 that are not used on any other occasion in surviving Aischylos (cf. also p. 329), and, although this is not necessarily of decisive importance because of the small sample of the Aischylean corpus that has reached us, it could be indicative. Such are the words λώτισμα, φύτευμα, ξυνωνία and ὑπερφέρω.[32] Considering the scale of the passage, the number of unattested words is noteworthy.

There is also the case of the flamboyant image of the last two lines of the passage to be discussed. Two vivid metaphors are piled up in these lines, an image of emotional turmoil involving a hope symbolically on the edge of a razor and a second image with a threatening reef. The translation by Lloyd-Jones for the passage reads: "Slender is my hope, and I stand balanced on the edge of doom, lest I strike against a reef and lose all I have."[33] Although Aischylos often uses vivid, sometimes daring, metaphors,[34] the rapid shift here is unusually bold. The problem is complicated by the fact that the lines are badly preserved and the restoration has caused controversy.[35] However, the rapid succession of vivid metaphors in the text, as presented by most recent editors, would not be unparalleled (cf. e.g. *Pers.* 163-4) and one hesitates to dismiss it as unAischylean, especially as we lack so much information on the majority of plays written by Aischylos.

---

[32] The word ἀνυπέρβατον, if correct, would also be *hapax*.

[33] Note that Lloyd-Jones (1963: 602) reads μένω instead of μένει in l. 22 (Radt 1985 and Diggle 1998) and translates accordingly.

[34] See the discussion in Garson (1983: 33-9) and (1984: 124-6).

[35] See Radt (1985: 221), for various suggestions in the *apparatus criticus*.

To conclude, although the scale of the sample makes one hesitant to speak with certainty, on balance the evidence available raises doubts against the assignment of *TrGF* iii fr. **99 to Aischylos. The density of unusual features, each of which taken alone might be acceptable, in such a short passage is suspicious. *TrGF* iii fr. **99 could be a prologue of a play on Europe and the death of her younger son, Sarpedon, but probably not the *Kares/Europe* of Aischylos that tradition attests to. As a result, the fragment and its authorship do not affect the authorship of the *Kares/Europe*. It is time to consider the second part of West's argument: is Euphorion, or, better still, the poet of the *Prometheus*, the poet of *TrGF* iii fr. **99?

West suggests that this play was presented under Aischylos' name by his son Euphorion *TrGF* i 12) and conjectures that this tragedy is dated to later years when Euphorion was active in the theatre.[36] Euphorion, as attested by the *Souda*, presented his father's plays.[37] We know that Aischylos competed for the last time in 458 B.C. with the *Oresteia* and won the first prize. The *didaskaliai* mention Euphorion twice: the first occasion is when he competed after 456 B.C. and won first prize with his father's tetralogy, shortly following Aischylos' death. We do not, however, know which tetralogy was involved. He is mentioned again in 431 B.C., when he won the first prize, defeating both Sophokles and Euripides' *Medeia*. Since the name of Aischylos is not mentioned on this occasion, it is

[36] West (2000: 350).

[37] *Souda* s.u. Εὐφορίων (*TrGF* i 12: *testimonium* 1 / *TrGF* iii *testimonium* A 2.3): υἱὸς Αἰσχύλου τοῦ τραγικοῦ, Ἀθηναῖος, τραγικὸς καὶ αὐτός· ὃς καὶ τοῖς Αἰσχύλου τοῦ πατρός, οἷς μήπω ἦν ἐπιδειξάμενος, τετράκις ἐνίκησεν. ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ οἰκεῖα. It is not clear whether τετράκις means four different times or with four plays, which would mean a tetralogy.

plausible to conclude that Euphorion competed and won with his own tetralogy in 431 B.C.

West notes certain similarities between expressions of the *Prometheus* and *TrGF* iii fr. **99.[38] West notes that the expression παρθένου σέβας / ἤμειψε resembles *Prometheus* l. 23: χροιᾶς ἀμείψεις ἄνθος.[39] This need not be of decisive importance, however. Closer still is the passage in Sophokles' *Trachiniai* ll. 736-7: λῴους φρένας / τῶν νῦν παρουσῶν τῶνδ' ἀμείψασθαί ποθεν. West, moreover, suggests that the verb χειμάζομαι is only used in the *Prometheus* (ll. 562-3; 838) and in *TrGF* iii fr. **99 (l. 15) and nowhere in genuine Aischylos.[40] Aischylos may never, as far as we know, have used this word but other tragic poets did. Sophokles, for example, uses the word χειμάζομαι, in the same sense of emotional turmoil, twice, in *Antigone* 391 and in *Philoktetes* 1460. Euripides does the same in *Hippolytos* 315: φιλῶ τέκν'· ἄλλῃ δ' ἐν τύχῃ χειμάζομαι. West may be right by claiming that these expressions are not Aischylean, but there was more than one poet using them, and, therefore, they cannot be used to establish a connection between *TrGF* iii fr. **99 and the *Prometheus*.

West notes, furthermore, that two of the twenty-three lines of *TrGF* iii fr. **99 start with an anapaest, one of them being a proper name; he remarks that the first-foot anapaest is one of Prometheus' particular features. It is true that the *Prometheus* has 12 occurrences, plus one proper name anapaest, whereas the

[38] West (2000: 348-9).

[39] West (2000: 349).

[40] West (2000: 349).

Seven, the *Hiketides* and the *Choephoroi* count only one each. Two occurrences can be counted in the *Persai*, five in the *Agamemnon* and three in the *Eumenides*.[41]

However, if we were to expand the comparison between *TrGF* iii fr. **99 and the *Prometheus*, we would realise that there are more differences than similarities. The *Prometheus* has an enjambment rate of 9.7% whereas fr. 99 has 13 %.[42] Furthermore, *TrGF* iii fr. **99 has 9% of interlinear hiatus but in the *Prometheus* no effort seems to have been made to avoid interlinear hiatus, the percentage being as high as 17%.[43] The percentage of word-end in the second position (x-/) is 65% for *TrGF* iii fr. **99, whereas the *Prometheus* has 55%.[44] Resolutions in the Aischylean corpus show a steady decrease in the iambic trimeters from the *Persai* onwards. Not counting resolutions involving proper names, the numbers are: *Persai* 11.0%, *Seven* 9.3%, *Hiketides* 8.4%, *Agamemnon* 4.8%, *Choephoroi* 5.2%, *Eumenides* 5.0%. Griffith notes that the uniformity of the figures for the *Oresteia* suggests that we do have a useful criterion for dating the plays.[45] The *Prometheus* has a percentage of 4.8%, which would assign it, in case of its genuineness, to the last phase of Aischylean dramaturgy. *TrGF* iii fr. **99, proper names aside, has four resolutions in its 23.5 lines (ll. 1; 4; 16; 21), raising its percentage to 16%. It seems that *TrGF* iii fr. **99 is even more distant from the *Prometheus* than it is from the Aischylean corpus. The poet of the

[41] Griffith (1977: 77); Herington (1970: 44).

[42] Griffith (1977: 96).

[43] Griffith (1977: 100). Note Herington (1970: 37).

[44] Griffith (1977: 94).

[45] Griffith (1977: 76). Also, see the numbers in Garvie (1969: 33).

Prometheus is, therefore, a less plausible candidate for the authorship of *TrGF* iii fr. **99 than Aischylos.

Euphorion could have been the author of one of the two, although for this too, there are no indications. The fact is that, even if Euphorion was the poet of the *Prometheus*, he would not necessarily be the poet of *TrGF* iii fr. **99. Euphorion is not the only candidate author for any of these plays; there were more, lesser known, but, possibly, good tragedians. If our doubts are correct, in the case of *TrGF* iii fr. **99 we are talking about a poet later than Aischylos, with certain differences from the technique of Aischylos and from that of the poet of the *Prometheus*. There is absolutely no indication who this poet was, and it would perhaps be more appropriate if the fragment was edited as an *adespoton* rather than under the name of Aischylos (with or without the sign **), or under the name of Euphorion, as West's article would perhaps suggest.

Whoever the poet of *TrGF* iii fr. **99 was, he most probably wrote on a story that was presented in Athenian theatre by Aischylos before him, and his play could have been influenced by the *Kares/Europe*. The relevant section of the *Kares/Europe* chapter discussing *TrGF* iii fr. **99 could alternatively be read as a case of reception of the Aischylean play in the work of another.[46] It is not implausible that, as in many other cases, younger tragedians would turn for inspiration to Aischylos and repeat the myths that he presented in his plays. This influence could even take a broader form. Europe as a heroine in *TrGF* iii fr.

[46] See pp. 191; 210.

**99 resembles, for example, many women of the Aischylean corpus, who are mothers in mourning, women once blessed with divine love and now passing the threshold from bliss to misfortune in a life of *peripeteia*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adkins, A.W.H, 1960: *Merit and Responsibility* (Oxford).

Aélion, R., 1983: *Euripide: héritier d'Eschyle* (Paris).

_____1983-4: 'Silences et personnages silencieux chez les tragiques', *Euphrosyne* 12, 31-52.

Alexiou, M., 1974: *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (Cambridge).

Allan, W., 2000: *The Andromache and Euripidean Tragedy* (Oxford).

Allen, G., 2000 [2003]: *Intertextuality* (London).

Alsina, J., 1959 : 'Observaciones sobre la figura de Clitemestra', *Emerita* 27, 297-321.

Antonaccio, C.M., 1995: *An Arcaheology of Ancestors: Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Early Greece* (Lanham/New York).

Arnott, P., 1962: *Greek Scenic Conventions* (Oxford).

Arvanitopoulos, A.S., 1929: 'Ἡ σύνθεσις τῆς *Τηλεφείας* καὶ τῆς *Ἀλκμαιωνείας*', *Polemon* 1, 181-92.

Austin, C., 1968: *Nova Fragmenta Euripidea: in Papyris Recepta* (Berlin).

_____1973: *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta: in Papyris Recepta* (Berlin).

Avezzù, G., 1988: *Il ferimento e il rito: la storia di Filottete sulla scena attica* (Bari).

Ashby, C., 1999: *Classical Greek Theatre: New Views of an Old Subject* (Iowa City).

Bacon, H., 1961: *Barbarians in Greek Tragedy* (New Haven).

Bain, D., 1977: '[Euripides], *Electra* 518-44', *BICS* 24, 104-16.

Barabino, G., 1956: 'I *Myrmidones* di Accio', in *Ἀντίδωρον Hugoni Enrico Pauli Oblatum, Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di filologia classica dell'Università di Genova* 8 (Genova) 57-72.

Barlow, S.A., 1981 [1986]: *Euripides, Trojan Women* (Warminster).

_____1989: 'Stereotype and reversal in Euripides' *Medea*', *G&R* 36, 158-71.

Barrett, W.S., 1964 [1978]: *Euripides, Hippolytus* (Oxford).

Barrett, J., 2004: 'Aeschylus' in (eds.) Jong, I., De, Nünlist R., and Bowie A., *Narrators, Narrattes, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature: Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* i (Leiden) 235-54.

Barringer, J.M., 1995: *Divine Escorts* (Michigan).

Barsby, J., 2001: *Terence* (Cambridge Massachusetts).

Basta Donzelli, G., 1980: 'Euripide: *Elettra* 518-44', *BICS* 27, 109-19.

Bauman, R.A., 1990: *Political Trials in Ancient Greece* (London/New York).

Bean, G.E., 1978: *Lycian Turkey* (London).

Beare, W., 1950 [1955]: *The Roman Stage* (London).

Beazley, J.D., 1947: *Etruscan Vase-Painting* (Oxford).

_____1963 [1968]: *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters* (Oxford).

_____1971: *Paralipomena: Additions to Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters and to Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters* (Oxford).

Bell, R.E., 1993: *Women of Classical Mythology* (Oxford).

Benedetto, V., Di, 1967: 'Il silenzio di Achille nei *Myrmidoni* di Eschilo', *Maia* 19, 373-86.

Bergk, T., 1880: 'Zu den neuen Bruchstucken griechischer Dichter', *RhM* 35, 244-64.

Bers, V., 1994: 'Tragedy and rhetoric', in (ed.) Worthington, I., *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action* (London/New York).

Beye, C.R., 1970: '*Sophocles' Philoctetes* and the Homeric embassy', *TAPhA* 101, 63-75.

Björck, G., 1957, 'The authenticity of *Rhesus*', *Eranos* 55, 7-17.

Blass, F., 1880 : 'Neue Fragmente des Euripides und anderer griechischer Dichter', *RhM* 35, 74-93.

Blume, H.D., 1978: *Einführung in das antike Theaterwesen* (Darmstadt).

Blundell, M.W., 1989 [1991]: *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies : A Study in Sophocles and Greek Ethics* (Cambridge).

Bothmer, D., Von, 1981: 'The death of Sarpedon', in (ed.) Hyatt, S.L., *The Greek Vase* (Latham) 64-80.

Bowie, A.M., 1993: 'Religion and politics in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*', *CQ* 43, 10-31.

Bowra, C.M., 1964: *Pindar* (Oxford).

Bremmer, J., 1983: *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul* (Princeton).

Broadhead, H.D., 1960: *The Persae of Aeschylus* (Cambridge).

Brown, A.R., 1984: 'Three and scene-painting Sophokles', *PCPhS* 30, 1-7.

Bryce, T.R., 1986: *The Lycians in Literary and Epigraphic Sources* (Copenhagen).

Bucalo, M.F., 1977: 'Il *Filottete* di Accio', *Studi Noniani* 4, 27-49.

Buecheler, F., 1880: 'Neue Fragmente griechischer Dichter', *RhM* 35, 93-7.

Bühler, W., 1973 : 'Tzetzes über die *Hektoros Lytra* des Dionysios', *ZPE* 11, 69-79.

Burgess, J.S., 2001: *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle* (Baltimore/London).

Burian, P., 1972: 'Supplication and hero cult in Sophocles' *Ajax*', *GRBS* 13, 151-6.

Burkert, W., 1997: 'From epiphany to cult-statue: early Greek *theos*' in (ed.) Lloyd, A.B., *What Is a God? Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity* (Swansea) 15-34.

_____1985: *Greek Religion*, transl. Raffan, J., (Oxford).

Burnett, A.P., 1971: *Catastrophe Survived: Euripides' Plays of Mixed Reversal* (Oxford).

Burstein, S.M., 1971: 'The recall of the ostracized and the Themistocles decree' *CSCA* 4, 93-110.

Burton, R.W.B., 1962: *Pindar's Pythian Odes* (Oxford).

Buxton, R.G.A., 1982: *Persuasion in Greek Tragedy: A Study of Peitho* (Cambridge).

Calder, W., 1970: 'Aeschylus' *Philoctetes*', *GRBS* 11, 171-9.

Cambitoglou, A., 1968: *The Brygos Painter* (Sydney).

Cantarella, R., 1941 : *Eschilo* i (Florence).

_____1964: *Euripide, I Cretesi* (Milano).

Cantarella, E., 1991: *I supplici capitali in Grecia e a Roma* (Milano).

Carey, C., 1981: *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar* (New York).

_____1994: 'Rhetorical means of persuasion', in (ed.) Worthington, I., *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action* (London/New York) 26-45.

_____1997: *Trials from Classical Athens* (London/New York).

_____2007: 'The political world of Homer and tragedy', *Aevum Antiquum, forthcoming.*

Carrière, J., 1977: *Le Choeur secondaire dans le drame grec* (Paris).

Caskey, L.D., and Beazley, J.D., 1963: *Attic Vase Paintings in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston* iii (Boston).

Cavaignac, E., 1921, 'Eschyle et Themistocle', *RPh* 45, 102-6.

Chitwood, A., 2004: *Death by Philosophy* (Michigan).

Christodoulou, G.A., 1977: *Τὰ ἀρχαῖα σχόλια εἰς Αἴαντα τοῦ Σοφοκλέους* (Athens).

Clark, M.E., and Coulson, W.D.E., 1978: 'Memnon and Sarpedon', *MH* 35, 65-73.

Clarke, W.M., 1978: 'Achilles and Patroclus in love', *Hermes* 106, 381-96.

Cobet, C.G., 1880: 'Fragmenta Inedita Poetarum Graecorum', *Mnemosyne* 8, 56-67.

Cohen, D., 1991: *Law, Sexuality and Society: The Enforcement of Morals in Classical Athens* (Cambridge).

Collard, C., 1975: *Euripides, Supplices* (Groningen).

Collard, C., Cropp M.J., and Lee, K.H., 1995: *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays* i (Warminster).

Colvin, S.C., 1999: *Dialect in Aristophanes* (Oxford).

Cozzoli, A.T., 2001: *Euripide, Cretesi* (Pisa/Rome).

Craik E., 1988: *Euripides, Phoenician Women* (Warminster).

Croiset, M., 1894 : 'Eschyle imitateur d'Homère', *REG* 7, 151-80.

Crompton, L., 2003: *Homosexuality and Civilization* (Cambridge Massachusetts).

Cropp, M.J., 2000: *Euripides, Iphigeneia in Tauris* (Warminster).

Cropp, M., and Fick, G., 1985: *Resolutions and Chronology in Euripides: The Fragmentary Tragedies, BICS* Suppl. 43.

Csapo, E.G., 1990: '*Hikesia* in the *Telephus* of Aeschylus', *QUCC* 63, 41-52.

_____2000: 'From Aristophanes to Menander? Genre transformation in Greek comedy' in (eds.) Depew, M., and Obbink, D., *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society* (Cambridge Massachusetts).

Csapo, E.G., and Slater, W.J., 1995 [1998]: *The Context of Ancient Drama* (Michigan).

Dain, A., 1965 : *Traité de métrique grecque* (Paris).

Danali-Giole, A., 1981: *Τὰ λύτρα τοῦ Ἕκτορος εἰς τὴν τέχνην τοῦ ἕκτου καὶ πέμπτου αἰ. π. Χ.* (Athens).

Davies, M., 1989: *The Epic Cycle* (Bristol).

_____1998: 'Euripides' *Electra*: the recognition scene again', CQ 48, 389-404.

Davies, M.I., 1971: 'The suicide of Ajax', *AK* 14, 148-57.

_____1973: 'Ajax and Tekmessa: a cup by the Brygos painter in the Bareiss collection', *AK* 16, 60-70.

Deforge, B., 1986: *Eschyle, poète cosmique* (Paris).

Denniston, J.D., 1939 [1968]: *Euripides, Electra* (Oxford).

Dietrich, B. C., 1964: 'The judgement of Zeus', *RhM* 107, 97-125.

Diggle, J., 1998: *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Selecta* (Oxford).

Ditifeci, M.T., 1984: 'Note al *Telefo* di Euripide', *Prometheus* 10, 210-20.

Dodds, E.R., 1944 [1960]: *Euripides, Bacchae* (Oxford).

_____1960: 'Morals and politics in the *Oresteia*', *PCPhS* 6, 19-31.

Döhle, B., 1983: 'Die *Achilleis* des Aischylos', in (ed.) Kuch, H., *Die griechische Tragödie in ihrer gesellschaftichen Funktion* (Berlin).

Dover, K.J., 1964: 'Aeschylus, Fr. 248 M', *CR* 14, 12.

_____1974 [1994]: *Greek Popular Morality* (Indianapolis/Cambridge).

_____1978: *Greek Homosexuality* (London).

_____1987: *Greek and the Greeks* (Oxford).

Duchemin, J., 1968: *L'Agon dans la tragédie grecque* (Paris).

Dumont, J.C., and François-Garelli, M.H, 1998: *Le Théatre à Rome* (Paris).

Earp, C.B., 1939: *A Study on the Fragments of Three Related Plays of Accius*, (Scottdale).

Easterling, P.E., 1981: 'The end of the *Trachiniae*', *BICS* 6, 56-74.

_____1982: *Sophocles, Trachiniae* (Cambridge).

_____1985: 'Anachronism in Greek tragedy', *JHS* 105, 1-10.

_____1987: 'Women in tragic space' *BICS* 34, 15-26.

_____1988: 'Tragedy and ritual', *Metis* 3, 87-109.

_____1993a: 'The end of an era: tragedy in the early fourth century', in (eds.) Sommerstein, A., Halliwell, S., Henderson, J., and Zimmermann, B., *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis* (Bari) 559-69.

_____1993b: 'Gods on stage in Greek tragedy' in (eds.) Dalfen, J., Petersmann, G., and Schwartz, F.F., *Religio Graeco-Romana* (Horn), 77-86.

_____1995: 'Menander: loss and survival', *BICS* Suppl. 66, 153-60.

_____1996 [2003]: 'Weeping, witnessing, and the tragic audience: response to Segal' in (ed.) Silk, M.S., *Tragedy and the Tragic: Greek Theatre and Beyond* (Oxford) 173-81.

Edmunds, L., 1981: 'The cults and the legend of Oedipus' *HSCPh* 85, 221-38.

Else, G.F., 1957: *Aristotle Poetics: The Argument* (Cambridge Massachusetts).

Fairweather, J.A., 1974: 'Fiction in the biographies of ancient writers', *AncSoc* 5, 231-75.

Falcetto, R., 2002: *Il Palamede di Euripide* (Allessandria).

Farnell, L.R., 1961: *Pindar: A Commentary* (Amsterdam).

Ferrari, L., 1982: *I drami perduti di Eschilo* (Palermo).

Figueira, T.J., 1987: 'Residential restrictions on the Athenian ostracized', *GRBS* 28, 281-305.

Finley, M.J., 1954 [1978]: *The World of Odysseus* (New York).

Finley, J.H., 1955: *Pindar and Aeschylus* (Cambridge Massachusetts).

Fitton Brown, A.D., 1961: 'The recognition scene in *Choephoroi*', *REG* 77, 363-70.

Foley, H.P, 1981: 'The conception of women in Athenian drama', in (ed.) Foley, H.P., *Reflections of Women in Antiquity* (New York) 127-68.

_____1996 [2003]: 'Antigone as moral agent' in (ed.) Silk, M.S., *Tragedy and the Tragic: Greek Theatre and Beyond* (Oxford) 49-73.

Fordsyke, S., 2000: 'Exile, ostracism and the Athenian democracy', *ClAnt* 19, 232-63.

Forrest, W.G., 1960: 'Themistocles and Argos', *CQ* 10, 221-41.

Fraenkel, E., 1943: *New Texts and Old Problems* (Oxford).

_____1950: *Aeschylus: Agamemnon* iii (Oxford).

Friis Johansen, K., 1967: *The Iliad in Early Greek Art* (Copenhagen).

Friis Johansen, H., and Whittle, E.W., 1980: *Aeschylus, Supplices* i (Copenhagen).

Fromhold-Treu, M., 1934: 'Die Telephos trilogie des Sophokles', *Hermes* 69, 324-38.

Frost, F.J., 1980: *Plutarch's Themistocles* (Princeton).

Gagarin, M., 1994: 'Probability and persuasion: Plato and early Greek rhetoric' in (ed.) Worthington, I., *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action* (London/New York) 46-68.

Gais, R.M., 1981: 'Aigisthos', *LIMC* i (Zürich/Munich) 371-9.

Galis, L., 1992: 'Medea's metamorphosis', *Eranos* 90, 65-81.

Gantz, T., 1979: 'Aischylos' lost plays: the fifth column', *CJ* 74, 210-22.

_____1980a: 'The Aeschylean tetralogy: prolegomena', *RhM* 123, 287-304.

_____1980b: 'The Aeschylean tetralogy: attested and conjectured groups', *AJPh* 101, 133-64.

_____1981: 'Divine guilt in Aischylos', *CQ* 31, 18-32.

Gardiner, C. P., 1979-80: 'The staging of the death of Ajax', *CJ* 75, 10-4.

Garland, R., 1985: *The Greek Way of Death* (London).

_____1992: *Introducing New Gods: The Politics of Athenian Religion* (London).

Garrison, E.P., 1991: 'Attitudes towards suicide in ancient Greece', *TAPhA* 121, 1-34.

Garson, R.W., 1983: 'Observations on some recurrent metaphors in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*', *AClass* 26, 33-9.

_____1984: 'Recurrent metaphors in Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*', *AClass* 27, 124-6.

Garvie, A.F., 1969: *Aeschylus' Supplices: Play and Trilogy* (Cambridge).

_____1986 [1988]: *Aeschylus, Choephoroi* (Oxford).

_____1998: *Sophocles, Ajax* (Warminster).

Garzya, A., 1991 [1995]: 'Sui frammenti dei *Mirmidoni* di Eschylo', in (ed.) López Férez, J.A., *Da Homero a Libanio* (Madrid) 41-56.

_____1995: 'Sui frammenti dei *Frigi* di Eschilo', *CFC* 5, 41-52.

Gellie, G., 1988: 'The character of Medea', *BICS* 35, 15-22.

Gentili, B., 1979: *Theatrical Performances in the Ancient World: Hellenistic and Early Roman Theatre* (Amsterdam).

Görschen-Flensburg, F.C., 1955: 'Neue Fragmente aus Aischylos' *Philoktet*', *Gymnasium* 62, 200-6.

Goldhill, S., 1986: *Reading Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge).

_____1995: *Foucault's Virginity: Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality* (Cambridge).

_____1996 [2003]: 'Collectivity and otherness- the authority of the tragic chorus: response to Gould' in (ed.) Silk, M.S., *Tragedy and the Tragic: Greek Theatre and Beyond* (Oxford) 244-56.

_____2003: 'Tragic emotions: the pettiness of envy and the politics' in (eds.) Konstan, D., and Rutter, N.K., *Envy, Spite and Jealousy: The Rivalrous Emotions in Ancient Greece* (Edinburgh) 165-80.

Gomme, A.W., 1945: *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford).

Gomme, A.W., and Sandbach, F.H., 1973 [1983]: *Menander: A Commentary* (Oxford).

Goossens, R., 1932 : 'La date du Rhésos', *AC* 1, 93-134.

Gottschalk, H.B., 1980: *Heraclides of Pontus* (Oxford).

Gould, J.P., 1973: '*Hiketeia*', *JHS* 93, 74-103.

_____1996 [2003]: 'Tragedy and collective experience' in (ed.) Silk, M.S., *Tragedy and the Tragic: Greek Theatre and Beyond* (Oxford) 217-43.

Gow, A.S.F., and Page, D.L., 1965: *Hellenistic Epigrams* ii (Cambridge).

Goward, B., 1999: *Telling Tragedy* (London).

Graham, W.J., 1958: 'The ransom of Hector on a new Melian relief', *AJA* 62, 313-9.

Graziosi, B., 2002: *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic* (Cambridge).

Green, J.R., 1991: 'On seeing and depicting the theatre in classical Athens', *GRBS* 32, 15-50.

_____1994: *Theatre in Ancient Greek society* (London/New York).

_____1999: 'Tragedy and the spectacle of the mind: messenger speeches, actors, narrative, and audience imagination in fourth-century B.C. vase-painting' in (eds.) Bergmann, B., and Kondoleon, C., *The Art of Ancient Spectacle* (New Haven) 37-64.

Green, J.R., and Handley, E., 1995: *Images of the Greek Theatre* (Austin).

Grégoire, H., 1933: 'L'authenticité de *Rhésos*', *AC* 2, 91-133.

Griffin, J., 1977: 'The epic cycle and the uniqueness of Homer', *JHS* 97, 39-53.

Griffith, M., 1977: *The Authenticity of the Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge).

Gurd, S.A., 2005: *Iphigenias at Aulis: Textual Multiplicity and Radical Philology* (Ithaca/London).

Hadjicosti, I.L., 2005: 'Hesiod fr. 212b (MW): Death at the Skaean Gates', *Mnemosyne* 58, 547-54.

_____2006a: 'Aeschylus fr. 168: Hera transformed on stage', *Kernos* 19, 291-301.

_____2006b: 'Semele and the death of Actaeon: Aeschylus fr. 221', *AClass* 49, 121-8.

_____2006c: 'Apollo at the wedding of Thetis and Peleus: Four problematic cases', *AC* 75, 15-22.

_____2006d: 'Tragedy as *paederastria* (Sophocles' *Niobe* fr. 441 and Aeschylus' *Myrmidones*)', *SIFC* 99, 131-5.

Hainsworth, B., 1993: *The Iliad: A Commentary* iii, (general ed.) Kirk, G.S., (Cambridge).

Haldane, J.A., 1965: 'Musical themes and imagery in Aeschylus', *JHS* 85, 33-41.

Hall, E., 1988: 'When did the Trojans turn into Phrygians? Alcaeus' 42.15', *ZPE* 73, 15-8.

_____1989: *Inventing the Barbarian* (Oxford).

_____1993: 'Political and cosmic turbulence in Euripides' *Orestes*' in (eds.) Sommerstein, A., Halliwell, S., Henderson, J., and Zimmermann, B., *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis* (Bari) 263-85.

_____1996: *Aeschylus, Persians* (Warminster).

_____1997 [1999]:'The sociology of Athenian tragedy' in (ed.) Easterling, P.E., *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge) 93-126.

Hall, J.M., 2002: *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago).

Hammond, N.G.L., 1972: 'The conditions of dramatic production to the death of Aeschylus', *GRBS* 13, 387-450.

Hammond, N.G.L., and Moon, W.G., 1978: 'Illustrations of early tragedy at Athens', *AJA* 82, 371-83.

Handley, E.W., and Rea, J., 1957: 'The *Telephus* of Euripides', *BICS* Suppl. 5, 18-39.

Hansen, M.H., 1975: *Eisangelia* (Odense).

_____1991: *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*, transl. Crook, J.A. (Oxford).

Harder, A, 1985: *Euripides' Kresphontes and Archelaos*, *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 87.

Harding, P., 1994: *Androtion and the Atthis* (Oxford).

Harris, E.M., 1994: 'Law and oratoty' in (ed.) Worthington, I., *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action* (London/New York) 130-50.

Harrison, E., 1976: 'The Portland vase: Thinking it over' in (eds.) Bonfante, L., and Heintze, H., Von, *Essays in Archaeology and Humanities in Memoriam of Otto J. Brendel* (Mainz) 131-42.

Harrison, T., 2000: *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus* (Oxford).

Haubold, J., 2000: *Homer's People: Epic Poetry and Social Formation* (Cambridge).

Heath, M., 1987: 'Euripides' *Telephus'*, *CQ* 37, 272-80.

Henrichs, A., 1980: 'Human sacrifice in Greek religion: three case studies', *Entretiens Hardt* 27, 195-235.

_____1983: 'The 'sobriety' of Oedipus: Sophocles *OC* 100 misunderstood', *HSCPh* 87, 87-100.

_____1993: 'The tomb of Aias and the prospect of hero cult in Sophokles', *ClAnt* 12, 165-80.

Heres, H., and Strauss, M., 1994: 'Telephos', *LIMC* vii (Zürich/Munich) 856-70.

Herington, C. J., 1970: *The Author of the Prometheus Bound* (Austin).

_____1972: 'Silent heralds: Aeschylus, Fr. 212a Mette', *RhM* 115, 199-203.

_____1985: *Poetry into Drama* (Berkeley).

Hermann, G., 1970: *Opuscula* (Hildescheim).

Hirschberger, M., 2004: *Gynaikon Katalogos und Megalai Ehoiai* (Leipzig).

Holt, P., 1989: 'The end of the *Trachiniai* and the fate of Herakles', *JHS* 109, 69-80.

_____1992: 'Ajax's burial in early Greek epic', *AJPh* 113, 319-31.

Holzhausen, J., 2003: *Euripides Politikos* (Leipzig).

Hornblower, S., 1991: *A Commentary on Thucydides* i (Oxford).

_____1996: *A Commentary on Thucydides* ii (Oxford).

Hornblower, S., and Spawforth, A., 1998: *The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilization* (Oxford).

Hughes, D.D., 1989: *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece: Literary and Archaeological Evidence* (Michigan).

Hutchinson, G.O., 1985: *Aeschylus, Septem Contra Thebas* (Oxford).

Huys, M., 1996: 'Euripides and the *Tales from Euripides*: sources of Apollodoros' *Bibliotheca*', *APF* 42, 308-27.

_____1997: 'Euripides and the *Tales from Euripides*: sources of the *Fabulae* of Ps.-Hyginus?', *RhM* 140, 168-78.

Huxley, G.L., 1969: *Greek Epic Poetry: From Eumelos to Panyassis* (London).

Icard Gianolo, N., and Szabados, A.V., 1992: 'Nereides' *LIMC* vi (Zürich/Munich) 785-824.

Isler-Kerényi, C., 1977: *Lieblinge der Meermädchen* (Zurich).

Jacoby, F., 1923: *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* i [*FGH*] (Berlin).

Jameson, R., 1960: 'A decree of Themistokles from Troizen', *Hesperia* 29, 198-223.

Janko, R., 1980: 'Aeschylus' *Oresteia* and Archilochus', *CQ* 30, 291-3.

_____1992: *The Iliad: A Commentary* iv, (general ed.) Kirk, G.S. (Cambridge).

Jebb, R.C., 1898: *Sophocles, The Plays and Fragments, Philoctetes* (Cambridge).

Johanson, M., 2001: 'The inscription from Troizen: a decree of Themistokles?' *ZPE* 137, 69-92.

Jouan, F., 1964: 'Le *Tennès* (?) d'Eschyle et la légende de Philoctète', *LEC* 32.1, 3-9.

_____1966: *Euripide et les légendes des chants cypriens* (Paris).

_____1983: *Euripide, Iphigenie à Aulis* (Paris).

Jouan, F., and Van Looy, H., 2000 : *Euripide: Fragments* (Paris).

Kamerbeek, J.C., 1953 [1963]: *The Plays of Sophocles: Ajax* (Leiden).

_____1974: *The Plays of Sophocles, Electra* (Leiden).

_____1980: *The Plays of Sophocles, Philoctetes* (Leiden).

_____1984: *The Plays of Sophocles, The Oedipus Coloneus* (Leiden).

Kakridis, J., 1949: *Homeric Researches* (Lund).

_____1958: 'Classical tragedy in the light of new texts', in (eds.) Hoëg, C., Krarup, P., Riis, J.P., and Magnussen, I., *Acta Congressus Madvigiani* i (Copenhagen) 142-58.

Kearns, E., 1989: *The Heroes of Attica*, *BICS* Suppl. 57.

Keen, A.G., 1998: *Dynastic Lycia: A Political History of the Lycians and their Relations with Foreign Powers* (Leiden).

_____2005: 'Lycians in the *Cares* of Aeschylus' in (eds.) MacHardy, F., Robson, J., and Harvey, D., *Lost Dramas of Classical Athens* (Exeter) 63-82.

Kennedy, G., 1963 [1964]: *The Art of Persuasion* (Princeton).

Kenyon, F.G., 1899: *Palaeography of Greek Papyri* (Oxford).

Kiefer, J.S., 1942: 'Philoctetes and Arete', *CP* 37, 38-50.

Kirk, G.S., 1985 [1995]: *The Iliad: A Commentary* i (general ed.) Kirk, G.S., (Cambridge).

Kirkwood, G., 1982: *Selections from Pindar* (Chico).

Kossatz-Deissmann, A., 1978: *Dramen des Aischylos auf westgriechischen Vasen* (Mainz am Rhein).

_____1981: 'Achilleus', *LIMC* i (Zürich/Munich) 37-200.

Kossyphopoulou, S., 1955: 'Η υπόθεση του Φιλοκτήτη του Αισχύλου', *Hellenika* 14, 449-51.

Kovacs, D., 1989: 'Euripides *Electra* 518-44: further doubts about genuineness', *BICS* 36, 67-78.

_____1995: 'Paralipomena Euripidea', *Mnemosyne* 48, 565-70.

Kron, V., 1999: 'Patriotic heroes' in (ed.) Hägg, R., *Ancient Greek Hero Cult* (Stockholm) 61-83.

Krumeich, R., Pechstein, N., and Seidensticker, B., 1999: *Das griechische Satyrspiel* (Darmstadt).

Kuch, H., 1993: 'Continuity and change in Greek tragedy under postclassical conditions' in (eds.) Sommerstein, A., Halliwell, S., Henderson, J., Zimmermann, B., *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis* (Bari) 545-57.

Kullmann, W., 1984: 'Oral poetry theory and neoanalysis in Homeric research', *GRBS* 25, 307-24.

Lada, I., 1996 [2003]: 'Emotion and meaning in tragic performance' in (ed.) Silk, M.S., *Tragedy and the Tragic: Greek Theatre and Beyond* (Oxford) 397-413.

Lang, M.L, 1990: *Ostraka, The Athenian Agora* 25 (Princeton)

Laurent, M., 1898: 'L'Achille voilé dans les peintures des vases grecs', *RA* 33, 153-86.

Lefkowitz, M., 1981: *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (Baltimore).

Lloyd, M., 1992: *The Agon in Euripides* (Oxford).

_____1994: *Euripides, Andromache* (Warminster).

Lloyd-Jones, H., 1963: '*Appendix*' in (ed.) Weir-Smyth, H., 1926 [1963] *Aeschylus,* (Cambridge, Massachusetts).

_____1961: 'Some alleged interpolations in Aeschylus' *Choephoroi* and Euripides' *Electra*', *CQ* 11, 171-84.

_____1966: 'Bruno Snell: *Scenes from Greek Drama*', *Gnomon* 38, 12-7.

_____1971: *The Justice of Zeus* (Berkeley).

_____1983: 'Artemis and Iphigeneia', *JHS* 103, 87-102.

Lobel, E., 1952: 'Aeschylus, Various plays', *P. Oxy.* 20, 1-65.

Loraux, N., 1998: *Mothers in Mourning*, trans. Pache, C., (Ithaca/London).

_____2002: *The Mourning Voice*, transl. Trapnell-Rowlings, E., (Ithaca/London).

Lucas, W., 1968: *Aristotle, Poetics* (Oxford).

Luzzatto, M.T., 1980: 'Sul *Filottete* di Eschilo', *SCO* 30, 97-122.

_____1983 : 'Il *Filottete* di Euripide, *Prometheus* 9, 199-220.

Luschnig, C.A.E., 1988: *Tragic Aporia: A Study of Euripides' Iphigeneia in Aulis*, *Ramus* Monographs 3.

MacClure, L., 1999: *Spoken Like a Woman* (Princeton).

MacDowell, D.M., 1978: *The Law in Classical Athens* (London).

MacLeod, M.D., 1967: *Lucian* viii (London).

MacLeod, C.W., 1982: 'Politics and the *Oresteia*', *JHS* 102, 124-44.

Malkin I., 2001: 'Greek ambiquities: between 'ancient Hellas' and 'barbarian Epirus'' in (ed.) Malkin, I., *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge Massachusetts) 187-212.

Mandel, O., 1981: *Philoctetes and the Fall of Troy* (Lincoln/London).

March, J., 1987: *The Creative Poet*, *BICS* Suppl. 49.

_____1991-3: 'Sophocles' *Ajax*: the death and burial of a hero', *BICS* 38, 1-36.

_____1998: *Dictionary of Classical Mythology* (London).

_____2001: *Sophocles, Electra* (Warminster).

Mariotti, I., 1960 : *Introduzione a Pacuvio* (Urbino).

Markantonatos, A., 2002: *Tragic Narrative: A Narratological Study of Sophocles' Oedipus at Colonus* (Berlin).

Maronitis, D.N., 2004: *Homeric Megathemes: War, Homilia, Home-Coming*, transl. Conolly, D. (Lanham).

Marr, J.L., and Worswick, N., 1994-5: 'The institution of ostracism at Athens', *Ostraka* 3, 285-90.

Marr, J.L., 1998: *Plutarch, Life of Themistocles* (Warminster).

Masia, A., 2000: *Ennio, Tragedias* (Amsterdam).

Massei, L., 1969: 'Problemi figurative di episodi epici', *SCO* 18, 148-77.

Mastronarde, D.J., 1990: 'Actors on high: the skene roof, the crane and the gods in Attic drama', *ClAnt* 9, 247-94.

_____1994: *Euripides, Phoenissae* (Cambridge).

_____2002: *Euripides, Medea* (Cambridge).

Meier, C., 1988: *The Political Art of Greek Tragedy*, trans. Webber, A., (Baltimore/London).

Mette, H. J., 1955: 'Literaturbericht über Aischylos', *Gymnasium* 62, 393-407.

_____1959 : *Die Fragmente der tragödien des Aischylos* (Berlin).

_____1963: *Der verlorene Aischylos* (Berlin).

Michelakis, P., 2002: *Achilles in Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge).

Mikalson, J.D., 1983: *Athenian Popular Religion* (Chapel Hill).

_____1991 [1995]: *Honor Thy Gods: Popular Religion in Greek Tragedy* (Chapel Hill/London).

Milani, L.A., 1879: *Il mito di Filottete* (Florence).

Miller, A.M., 1994: 'Nestor and Sarpedon in Pindar *Pythian* 3 (again)' *RhM* 137, 383-6.

Miller, H.W., 1948: 'Euripides' *Telephus* and the *Thesmophoriazusae* of Aristophanes' *CPh* 43, 174-83.

Mioni, E., 1973: *Introduzione alla paleografia greca* (Padova).

Moreau, A., 1996: 'Eschyle et les tranches des repas d'Homère: la trilogie d'Achille', *CGITA* 9, 3-29.

Moret, J.M., 1975: *L'Ilioupersis dans la céramique italiote* (Rome).

Most, G.M., 1997: 'Reflections' in (ed.) Most, G.M., *Collecting Fragments* (Göttingen) 6-8.

Muecke, F., 1982: '"I know you-by your rags": costume and disguise in fifth century drama', *Antichthon* 16, 17-34.

Mühll, P., Von der, 1958: 'Wurde die elfte *Pythie* Pindars 474 oder 454 gedichtet?' in *MH* 15, 141-6.

Müller, C.W, 2000: '*Euripides Philoktet*: *Testimonien und Fragmente* (Berlin).

Nagy, G., 1983: 'On the death of Sarpedon' in (eds.) Rubino, C.A., and Shelmerdine, C.W., *Approaches to Homer* (Austin) 189-217.

Nauck, A., 1926 [1964]: *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, with *Supplementum* by Snell, B. (Hildesheim).

Obbink, D., 2005: 'New literary texts: Archilochus, Elegies', *P. Oxy.* 69, 18-42.

Owen, E., 1989: *The Story of the Iliad* (Bristol).

Pagani, G., 1970: 'Il *Reso* di Euripide: il drama di un eroe', *Dioniso* 44, 30-43.

Page, D. L., 1950: *Greek Literary Papyri* (Cambridge Massachusetts).

_____1959: *History and the Homeric Iliad* (Berkeley).

_____1974: *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis* [*SLG*] (Oxford).

_____1991: *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* [*PMGF*] (Oxford).

Papagiannopoulos-Palaios, A., 1929: 'Ἀττικαὶ Ἐπιγραφαί', *Polemon* 1, 161-81.

Papathomopoulos, M., 1981: 'Tzetzès et les *Hektoros Lytra* de Denys', *REG* 94, 200-5.

Parker, R., 1996: *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford).

_____2005: *Polytheism and Society at Athens* (Oxford).

Pasquali, G., 1934 [1962]: *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (Florence).

Pathmanathan, R., Sri., 1965: 'Death in Greek tragedy', *G&R* 12, 2-14.

Percy, W.A., 1996: *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece* (Urbana).

Pestalozzi, H., 1945: *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias* (Zürich).

Pickard-Cambridge, A., 1946: *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens* (Oxford)

_____1953: *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* (Oxford).

Pipili, M., 1994: 'Philoktetes' *LIMC* vii (Zürich/Munich) 376-85.

Podlecki, A.J., 1966 [1999]: *The Political Background of Aeschylean Tragedy* (London).

_____1989 [1992]: *Aeschylus, Eumenides* (Warminster).

Porter, J.R., 1994: *Studies in Euripides' Orestes* (Leiden).

Prag, A.J.N.W., 1985: *The Oresteia: Iconographic and Narrative Tradition* (Warminster).

Preiser, C., 2000a: *Euripides: Telephus, Spoudasmata* 78 (Zürich).

_____ 2000b: 'Die Opferung der Iphigenie- ein Motiv in Euripides' *Telephos*?', *WJA*, 24, 29-35.

_____2001: 'Achilleus' heilmittel für Telephos in den *Kyprien*, in Euripides' *Telephos*, bei Plinius und bei Apollodor', *RhM* 144, 227-86.

Price, S., and Kearns, E., 2003: *The Oxford Dictionary of Classical Myth and Religion* (Oxford).

Race, W.H., 1997: *Pindar* (Cambridge Massachusetts).

Radt, S., 1983: 'Sophokles in seinen Fragmenten', *Entretiens Hardt* 29, 185-231.

Rau, P., 1967: *Paratragodia, Zetemata* 45.

Rawson, E., 1972: 'Aspects of Euripides' *Orestes*', *Arethusa* 5, 155-67.

Raven, D.S., 1962: *Greek Metre* (London).

Rea, J.R., 1971, 'A new reading in PSI 11. 1211-Aeschylus *Myrmidons'*, *ZPE* 7, 93-4.

Reynolds L.D., and Wilson, N.G., 1991: *Scribes and Scholars* (Oxford).

Rhodes, P.J., 1972: *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford).

_____1981: *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford).

_____2003: 'Nothing to do with democracy: Athenian drama and the polis', *JHS* 123, 104-19.

_____2004: 'Keeping to the point' in (eds.) Harris, E.M., and Rubinstein, L., *The Law and the Courts in Ancient Greece* (London) 137-58.

Richardson, N., 1993: *The Iliad: A Commentary* vi (general ed.) Kirk, G. S. (Cambridge).

Ritchie, W., 1964: *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides* (Cambridge).

Roberts, C.H., and Skeat, T.C., 1983 [1985]: *The Birth of the Codex* (Oxford).

Roberts, J.T., 1976: *The Impeachment of Generals at Athens during the Classical Period: A Study in Political Accountability* (Michigan).

_____1982: *Accountability in Athenian Government* (Winsconsin).

Robertson, M., 1969: '*Geryoneis*: *Stesichorus* and the vase-painters', *CQ* 19, 207-21.

_____1975: *History of Greek Art* (Cambridge).

_____1987: *Greek, Etruscan and Roman vases in the Lady Lever Art Gallery Port Sunlight* (Liverpool).

_____1988: 'Sarpedon brought home' in (eds.) Betts, J.H., Hooker, J.T., and Green, J.R., *Studies in Honour of T.B.L. Webster* ii (Bristol) 109-20.

Roisman, J., 1981: *Exile and Politics in Early Greece: From the Time of Homer to the End of the Archaic Period* (Washington).

Russo, J., 1999: 'Stesichorus, Homer, and the forms of early epic', in (eds.) Kazazis, J.N., and. Rengakos, A.R., *Euphrosyne*: *Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honour of D.N. Maronitis* (Stuttgart) 339-48.

Samons, L.J., 1999: 'Aeschylus, the Alkmeonids and the reform of the Areopagos', *CJ* 94, 221-33.

Sandin, P., 2003: *Aeschylus' Supplices : Introduction and Commentary on vv. 1-523* (Göteborg).

Schadewaldt, W., 1936: '*Achilleis*', *Hermes* 71, 25-69.

_____1944: *Von Homers Welt and Werk* (Leipzig).

Schaps, D.M., 1993: 'Aeschylus' politics and the theme of the *Oresteia*' in (eds.) Rosen, R.M., and Farrell, J., *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald* (Michigan) 505-15.

Schettino Nobile, C., 1969: *Il pittore di Telefo* (Rome).

Schlesinger, A.C., 1936: 'Indications of parody in Aristophanes', *TAPhA* 67, 296-314.

_____1937: 'Identification of parodies in Aristophanes', *AJPh* 58, 294-305.

Schoeck, G., 1961: *Ilias und Aethiopis* (Zürich).

Scodel, R., 1980: *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides* (Göttingen).

Scullion, S., 1994: *Three Studies in Athenian Dramaturgy* (Leipzig).

_____2002: 'Tragic dates', *CQ* 52, 81-101.

Seaford, R., 1996: *Euripides, Bacchae* (Warminster).

Séchan, L., 1926: *Études sur la tragédie grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique,* (Paris).

Segal, C., 1977: 'Bacchylides reconsidered: epithets and the dynamics of lyric narrative', *QUCC* 22, 99-130.

_____1981: *Tragedy and Civilization*: *An Interpretation of Sophocles* (Cambridge Massachusetts).

_____1996 [2003]: 'Catharsis, audience, and closure in Greek tragedy' in (ed.) Silk, M.S., *Tragedy and the Tragic: Greek Theatre and Beyond* (Oxford) 149-172.

Seidensticker, B., 1995: 'Women on the tragic stage' in (ed.) Goff, B., *History, Tragedy, Theory: Dialogues on Athenian Drama* (Austin) 151-73.

Severyns, A., 1928: *Le Cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque* (Liège).

Shapiro, H.A., 1989: *Art and Cult under the Tyrants in Athens* (Mainz am Rhein).

_____1994: *Myth into Art: Poet and Painter in Classical Greece* (London/New York).

Shefton, B.B., 1973: 'Agamemnon or Ajax', *RA*, 203-18.

Silk, M.S., 1987: *Homer: The Iliad* (Cambridge).

_____2000: *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy* (Oxford).

Slatkin, M.L., 1986: 'The wrath of Thetis', *TAPhA* 116, 1-24.

Small, J.P., 2003: *The Parallel Worlds of Classical Art and Text* (Cambridge/New York).

Snell, B., 1953: 'The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part 20', *Gnomon* 25, 433-40.

_____1964: *Scenes from Greek Drama* (Berkeley).

Solmsen, F., 1949: *Hesiod and Aeschylus* (Ithaca/New York).

_____1981: 'The sacrifice of Agamemnon's daughter in Hesiod's *Ehoeae*', *AJPh* 102, 353-8.

Sommerstein, A.H., 1989: *Aeschylus, Eumenides*, (Cambridge).

_____1993: 'The theatre audience, the demos, and the *Suppliants* of Aeschylus', in (ed.) Pelling, C., *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (Oxford) 63-79.

_____1996: *Aeschylean Tragedy* (Bari).

Sourvinou-Inwood, C., 2003: *Tragedy and Athenian Religion* (Lanham).

Staltmayr, M., 1991: 'Aischylos und die Phryger', *Hermes* 119, 367-74.

Stanford, W.B., 1954 [1963]: *The Ulysses Theme* (Oxford).

_____1963: *Sophocles, Ajax* (London).

Stansbury-O' Donnell, M.D., 1990: 'Polygnotos' *Nekyia*: a reconstruction and analysis', *AJA* 94, 213-35.

Steffen, W., 1952: *Satyrographorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Poxnan).

Sultan, N., 1999: *Exile and the Poetics of Loss in Greek Tradition* (Lanham).

Sutton, D.F., 1980: *The Greek Satyr Play* (Meisenheim am Glan).

_____1984: *The Lost Sophocles* (Lanham).

_____1987: *Two Lost Plays of Euripides* (New York).

_____1989: *Dithyrambographi Graeci* (Munich/Zürich).

Synodinou, K., 1985: 'Clytaemnestra in the *Iphigeneia at Aulis* of Euripides: from submission to revolt', *Dodone* 14, 55-65.

Szarmach, M., 1974a: 'Le mythe de Palamède avant la tragédie grecque', *Eos* 62, 35-47.

_____1974b: 'Les tragédies d'Eschyle et Sophocle sur Palamède', *Eos* 62, 193-204.

_____1975: 'Le *Palamède* d'Euripide', *Eos* 63, 249-71

Taplin, O., 1972: 'Aeschylean silences and silences in Aeschylus', *HSCPh* 76, 57-97.

_____1977: *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (Oxford).

_____1978: *Greek Tragedy in Action* (Berkeley/Los Angeles).

_____1987: 'Classical phallology, iconographic parody and potted Aristophanes' Dioniso 57, 95-109.

_____1993: *Comic Angels* (Oxford).

_____1997 [1999]: 'The pictorial record' in (ed.) Easterling, P.E., *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge), 69-90.

_____1998: 'Narrative variation in vase-painting and tragedy: the example of Dirke', *AK* 41, 33-9.

_____1999: 'Spreading the word through performance' in (eds.) Goldhill, S., and Osborne, R., *Performance, Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge) 33-57.

Thalmann, W.G., 1982: 'The Lille Stesichorus and the *Seven against Thebes*', *Hermes* 110, 385-91.

Thomas, R., 1989: *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*, (Cambridge).

Thomsen, R., 1972: *The Origin of Ostracism* (Copenhagen).

Thomson, G., 1961: *Greek Lyric Metre* (Cambridge).

Touchefeu, O., and Krauskopf, I., 1981: 'Agamemnon' *LIMC* i (Zürich/Munich) 256-77.

Trendall, A.D., 1967: *The Red-Figured Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily* (Oxford).

Trendall, A.D., and Webster, T.B.L., 1971: *Illustrations of Greek Drama* (London).

Trendall, A.D., and Cambitoglou, A., 1978: *The Red-Figured Vases of Apulia* (Oxford).

Turner, E.G., 1952 [1954]: *Athenian Books in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.*, (London).

_____1962a: 'Hypotheses of Euripides' plays', *P. Oxy.* 27, 32-70.

_____1962b: 'Euripides' *Telephus*', *P. Oxy.* 27, 87-100.

Turner, E.G., and Parsons, P.J., 1987: *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, *BICS* Suppl. 46.

Valsa, M., 1957: *Marcus Pacuvius: Poète tragique* (Paris).

Vanderpool, E., 1973: 'Ostracism at Athens' in (eds.) Sjöqvist, E., et al., *Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple* (Cincinnati) 215-50.

Vermeule, E., 1966: 'The Boston *Oresteia* Krater', *AJA* 70, 1-22

Vernant, J.P., and Vidal-Naquet, P., 1986: *Mythe et tragédie en Grèce ancienne* (Paris).

Walcot, P., 1978: *Envy and the Greeks: A Study of Human Behaviour* (Warminster).

Waldock, A.J.A., 1951 [1966]: *Sophocles*: *The Dramatist* (Cambridge).

Webster, T.B.L., 1936 [1969]: *An Introduction to Sophocles* (London).

_____1962 [1967]: *Monuments Illustrating Tragedy and Satyr Play*, *BICS* Suppl. 14.

Wecklein, N., 1880: 'Zu den Fragmente der griechischen Tragiker', *Philologus* 39, 406-18.

Weil, H., 1879: 'Un papyrus inédit de la bibliothèque d'Ambroise Firmin-Didot: Nouveaux fragments d'Euripide et d'autres poètes grecs', *Monuments grecs publiés par l'Association pour l'encouragement des études grecques en France* 8, 1-36.

_____1880: 'Sur l'*Europe* d' Eschyle', *RPh* 4, 145-50.

Weir-Smyth, H., 1926 [1963]: *Aeschylus* (London).

Weiss, C., 1986: 'Eos', *LIMC* iii (Zürich/Munich) 747-89.

Welcker, F.G., 1839: *Die griechischen Tragödien* (Bonn).

_____1973: *Kleine Schriften zur griechischen Literatur* iii (Osnaburg).

West, M.L., 1971: 'Stesichorus', *CQ* 21, 302-14.

_____1973: *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* (Stuttgart).

_____1979: 'The parodos of the *Agamemnon*', *CQ* 29, 1-6.

_____1980: 'Tragica IV', *BICS* 27, 9-22.

_____1982 [1996]: *Greek Metre* (Oxford).

_____1983 'Tragica VI' *BICS* 30, 63-82.

_____1985: *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford) 1985.

_____ 1987: *Euripides, Orestes* (Warminster).

_____1989: 'The early chronology of Attic tragedy', *CQ* 39, 251-4.

_____1997: *The East Face of Helikon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford).

_____2000: '*Iliad* and *Aethiopis* on the stage: Aeschylus and son', *CQ* 50.2, 338-52.

West, S., 1984: 'Io and the dark stranger (Sophocles, *Inachus* F 269a)', *CQ* 34, 292-302.

White, N., 2002: *Individual and Conflict in Greek Ethics* (Oxford/New York).

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U., Von, 1893: *Aristoteles und Athen* (Berlin).

_____1914: *Aischylos Interpretationen* (Berlin).

Wilcken, U., 1927: *Urkunden der Ptolemärzeit* (Berlin).

Willcock, M., 1997: 'Neoanalysis' in (eds.) Morris, I., and Powell, B., *New Companion to Homer* (Leiden).

Willink, C.W., 1986: *Euripides, Orestes* (Oxford).

Wilson, J., 1987: *Athens and Corcyra: Strategy and Tactics in the Peloponnesian War* (Bristol).

Wilson, J.P., 1997 [2000]: *The Hero and the City: An Interpretation of Sophocles' Oedipus at Colonus* (Michigan).

Wilson, P., 2000: 'Powers of horror and laughter', in (ed.) Taplin, O., *Literature in the Greek World* (Oxford) 70-114.

Winnington-Ingram, R.P., 1959: 'The LOEB Aeschylus', *CR* 73, 239-41.

_____1969: 'Euripides: *poietes sophos' Arethusa* 2, 127-42.

Woodford, S., 1993: *The Trojan War in Ancient Art* (Ithaca/New York).

_____1994: 'Palamedes seeks revenge', *JHS* 114, 164-9.

Woodhead, A.G., 1962: *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 18 [*SEG*] (Leiden).

Yamagata, N., 1994: *Homeric Morality, Mnemosyne* Suppl. 131.

Zanetto, I., 1993 : *Euripides, Rhesus* (Leipzig).

Zardini, F., 2000 : 'Il mito d'Europa in un drama di Eschilo', in (ed.) Sordi, M., *Studi sull' Europa antica*, (Alessandria) 51-67.

Zeitlin, F.I, 1980: 'The closet of masks: role-playing and myth-making in the *Orestes* of Euripides', *Ramus* 9, 51-77.

_____1990: 'Playing the other: theatre, theatricality and the feminine in Greek drama', in (eds.) Winkler, J.J., and Zeitlin, F.I., *Nothing to Do with Dionysus?*, (Princeton) 63-95.

Zielinski, T., 1925: *Tragodumenon libri tres* (Krakow).

Zografou-Lyra, G., 1987: *Παλαμήδης* (Ioannina).